AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NEW SERIES—VOL. VIII.—(XVIII.)—MARCH, 1898.—NO. 3.

GETHSEMANE.[1]

A CRITICAL STUDY IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

THE Hebrew word "Gethsemane," signifying oil-press, is the name given to an olive orchard situated a little to the east of the Valley of Kedron, at the foot of the Mount of Olives. St. Luke mentions the Mount of Olives as the place to which Jesus retired after the Last Supper, and where He appears to have spent the several nights since His return to Jerusalem.

When He reached Gethsemane our Saviour, according to St. Mark, takes with Him Peter, and James and John, who had been present at the awakening from the dead of the daughter of Jairus, and at the Transfiguration. He leaves the others at the entrance, to rest there, whilst He withdraws alone to pray. St. Luke does not mention who the Apostles that accompanied Jesus were. Perhaps the fact was not recorded in the primitive Gospel, and St. Mark may have had it from some other source. If St. Luke is silent about the anguish which overmastered Jesus, the reason can hardly be that he wished to shorten the account of the sad series of our Lord's sufferings, for he proceeds shortly afterward to relate the terrible struggle, in words more vivid and striking than those of the other Evangelists. If we except the verses

1 Matth., xxvi., 36-46; Mark, xiv., 32-42; Luke, xxii., 39-46.

concerning the Sweat of Blood, it appears that the source from which the third Gospel derived its description is identical in its essential features with that which St. Mark gives us and which he received, very likely, from the instructions of St. Peter.

From the text of the three Synoptic Gospels we glean that our Lord wished to pray alone; desiring at the same time that the Apostles should be near at hand. According to St. Mark and St. Matthew, He unbosoms Himself to the three, that is, to St. Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, telling them of the sorrow of His Heart, a sorrow unto death, on account of the Sacrifice which He is about to make. This saddening foresight had been present to His mind through the hours just past, during the Last Supper and the discourse to His disciples which followed it. This same thought inspired the institution of the Blessed Eucharist. Now it overpowers His soul and troubles it in its utmost depths. St. Luke, who does not mention the three successive returns of our Lord, after describing the command to pray as given to the eleven from the beginning: "Pray that you enter not into temptation," tells us that He withdrew about a stone's throw. The word which is used in the third Gospel (ἀπεσπάσθη) indicates not merely that Jesus separated from them, but that He was drawn away by the violence of His emotion. Since He was not far off and we cannot suppose that the disciples fell asleep at once, we must assume that they saw and heard our Lord as He began to pray. According to St. Mark, He prostrated Himself, beseeching His heavenly Father that the agony might pass from Him, if such could be the Divine Will. The word "hour", which St. Mark uses, signifies the same as the word "cup" in the prayer of Jesus: "Take this cup from me." The fact that the three Evangelists vary considerably in the actual expression of the prayer, shows that apostolic tradition attached more importance to the spirit than to the literal form of the words. The same remark may be applied to the terms used in the institution of the Blessed Eucharist under the form of bread and wine. According to St. Mark, Jesus said three

times: "Abba, Father, all things are possible to Thee; take away this cup from me; nevertheless, not what I will, but what Thou wilt." It would seem as if the cup which our Saviour had given to His disciples a short time before as a memorial of His death, were still present to His mind. He has not yet drunk the cup of His Passion; and now that it is to be drained His human nature shrinks; but whilst the inferior part of that nature seeks for life, the superior Will of the Son of Man accepts with resignation the decree of the Father, which is irrevocable. Jesus begs and obtains the strength necessary to perform the sacrifice demanded by His vocation. His prayer is a true prayer, not a mere contemplation of the divine decrees, interrupted, as it were, by the claims of nature fearful of death. St. Mark introduces into the prayer of our Lord the word "Abba," with the explanatory "Father," showing that the use of the Aramaic word had been preserved in the primitive Church as a kind of sacramental word. [1]

There is some indication of a certain dependence of the first Gospel on the second, for St. Matthew, instead of writing "Remove that cup from me," [2] has "Let this cup pass from me;" that is to say, he uses, when speaking of the cup, the verb which St. Mark used when he spoke of the hour. In the latter case the association of ideas is less natural, because the "pass" suits the metaphor of the "hour," whilst the verb "remove" corresponds to that of the "cup." In the same way the expression "if it is possible" instead of "all things are possible to Thee," sounds like an echo of St. Mark's words: "He prayed that, if it might be, the hour might pass from Him." The second Gospel gives, as it were, a twofold exposition of the prayer: one indirect, the other direct, so that it would appear as if the first Gospel, whilst showing the influence of

1 Cf. Rom., viii., 15; Gal., iv., 6.

2 I do not think that the first Gospel is a mere translation of the Hebrew Gospel; and maintain that the Greek Gospel of St. Matthew shows a decided influence of St. Mark's style; on the other hand it is plain that St. Mark himself depends to some extent on the Hebrew Gospel.

St. Mark's rendering, maintains the primitive character of the Hebrew original. As if by way of compensation, the writer of the first Gospel repeats the prayer of Jesus after He had returned the second time to the spot apart from the disciples. But the manner is changed. Our Saviour does not ask that the cup might pass from Him, but He declares Himself prepared to drink it, if the Father so wills it. The words: "Thy Will be done," recall those which Jesus taught His disciples in the Lord's Prayer. However, we have an analogous expression in St. Luke's Gospel, so that nothing hinders the inference that the three Evangelists drew from a primitive Gospel which suggested the repetition of the same words. For the rest, the words convey the most complete expression of perfect obedience on the part of our Lord, and therefore suggested themselves naturally.

St. Luke, according to the best manuscripts of the Greek text, records a prayer which is in reality an unfinished pleading: "Father, if Thou be willing to remove the cup from me!" The phrase is expressive enough when we remember that the Sacred Heart is dominated by a sentiment of perfect abandonment to the Divine Will, a sentiment which appears in the second part of the prayer: "But yet not my will but Thine be done."

In the narrative as given by both St. Mark and St. Matthew, Jesus after His first prayer returns to the three disciples and finds them sleeping. Their minds as well as their bodies were weary. The saddening scene of the Last Supper, the predictions and warnings of their beloved Master, although they had but half understood them, had, so to say, dazed them and rendered them impassive by reason of their very load of grief. They yielded to the overburdening weight and fell asleep. Jesus calls them, addressing Peter as if to show that from him at least, as from their chief, He had expected a deeper sympathy: "Simon, so thou sleepest?" The use here of the name "Simon" does not bear any special significance. It is the way in which Jesus and the disciples would be likely to address him. Only after the Resurrection did the name "Peter" replace

entirely that of "Simon," since its owner had in reality become the corner-stone of the Church. The writer of the first Gospel in giving the words of our Lord addressed to Peter, omits the phrase: "Simon, sleepest thou?"—and instead of saying "Could'st thou not watch one hour?"—he uses the plural "Could you not watch one hour with me?" Why is that St. Peter is named alone, although Jesus addresses the three disciples? Very likely because the Evangelist has taken the beginning of his account from St. Mark whilst in the main he retained the facts as related in the Hebrew Gospel. By intimating that the Apostles were unable to watch one hour with Him, our Lord does not fix the duration of His prayer; it had evidently lasted for a long while. He bids the three disciples watch and pray, that they enter not into temptation. They were to prepare for the approaching conflict. "The spirit is willing"—a man who does not realize the dangers that await him, believes himself ready to fulfil his duty; but "the flesh is weak"—that is to say, fear and discouragement affect the man when unexpected difficulties confront him and call upon him to show what real virtue he possesses.

After this exhortation Jesus leaves once more the three disciples, repeats the same prayer, and returns. Once more he finds them sleeping. It is perhaps a little strange that St. Luke, in his narration of the Transfiguration,[1] should make use of the words which the second Evangelist employs here: "For their eyes were heavy;" and that St. Mark should reproduce with but a slightly different shade of meaning, a detail which he describes in the same relation of the Transfiguration: "And they knew not what to answer Him."[2] At Gethsemane the confusion of the Apostles is not due to astonishment, such as took possession of them at the Transfiguration; it was simply that they could not find anything to say to Him. To explain this similarity of expression, we must remember that the two scenes of the Transfiguration and of the Agony were associated in the minds of

1 Luke, ix., 32. 2 Mark, ix., 6.

the disciples as the two extremes of glory and of sorrow of which their Master had been the central figure before His Passion. In like manner we may explain the apparent mutual dependence of the two narratives as to historical details and the manner of presenting them.

St. Mark tells us that the disciples did not know what to answer our Lord, and thus implies that He had reproached them as before. He indicates our Lord's return to them a third time. St. Matthew, on the other hand, mentions only the third departure of our Saviour.

After His last admonition to the three Apostles, Jesus is prepared for the great Sacrifice; the anguish of His soul is over. He has no longer need of their sympathizing presence. The expression used in the second Gospel, ἀπέχει, "it is enough," plainly implies that Jesus no longer expects His disciples to watch with Him; for the hour which He feared before this prayer, the hour when He would be delivered to His enemies, is come, and He has ceased to fear. We are not to suppose that these words of our Lord are meant ironically, nor, on the other hand, that He really wished them to give themselves to rest. He only implies that He expects His enemies to approach momentarily: and, indeed, while He is still speaking, the tumult of the band coming to take Him is heard. This is the reason why the first words seem to be contradicted by those that follow: "Rise up, let us go. Lo! he that will betray me is at hand." Before Jesus has concluded His words, Judas appears with the satellites sent by the Sanhedrin. Some commentators think that St. Luke deliberately abridges this dramatic *mise en scène;* and, in fact, the narrative would appear much shortened if we omit the part relating to the apparition of the angel and the Sweat of Blood, which some critics consider an interpolation. Indeed, it is quite possible that St. Luke should have abridged the story as given by St. Mark. We find, on the whole, that the sections which are common to the three Synoptics are shortened in the third Gospel. In the present case, however, it is not improbable that both as to form and matter, that is, the choice of the three disciples, the three successive prayers,

and the dramatic conclusion which is found in the first two Gospels, St. Mark has been the model, at least in part, for the other writers. We may then reasonably assume that there existed an account anterior to the Gospel of St. Mark, which did not contain all the details afterwards inserted by this Evangelist, and which he learnt from St. Peter. But there are also good reasons, found in the manner of St. Luke's narrative, which lead us to suppose that the third Gospel was not intended to be merely an abridgment of St. Mark. Very likely St. Luke had before him a source which followed strictly the narration of the Agony as given in the Hebrew Gospel. On the other hand, St. Mark seems to have introduced into his narrative the special information which he had received on this subject.

The question will be asked whether the passage respecting the Sweat of Blood and the apparition of the angel constitutes a genuine part of the primitive Gospel, or is rather a fragment from an oral tradition? Or again, might we suppose, as many critics do, these portions to be an ancient insertion in the third Gospel made for the purpose of increasing, by a legendary development, the apostolic tradition regarding the Agony of our Saviour. Modern critics have, no doubt, been somewhat hasty in questioning the genuineness of these verses of St. Luke. From the standpoint of internal criticism they are well connected with the context, and their omission, it would seem, leaves the narrative incomplete and mutilated. As regards the external evidence, the earliest Fathers and St. Justin, the first among them, witness to the passage. It was found in the old Vulgate; it is in the Sinaitic MS., and in the so-called Western witnesses. Such venerable authorities are not outweighed by the Vatican MS., the Alexandrine and Palestinian witnesses, to which we should now add the Sinaitic Gospel. The omission of the passage in witnesses of such importance shows, however, that the old Alexandrine and Palestinian copyists of the evangelical text did not admit these texts.[1] Nevertheless, the value

1 The opinion that the Vatican MS. represents a neutral text seems very improbable.

of this testimony is only relative, since the omission of the passage is more easily explained than its insertion. The tendency of early Christian teaching was rather against emphasizing too much those circumstances of the life of Jesus which concerned His purely human side. They might have been shocked to think that the Son of God had need of being strengthened by an angel, and of being overwhelmed with the thoughts of His Death. That such scruples were felt, especially at Alexandria, and that in teaching doctrine they should have dropped this passage from certain copies in common use, is a hypothesis much more acceptable than that of an insertion or interpolation, for which we can find neither an adequate explanation nor any actual record.

It is impossible to say, however, whether or not this passage may have been found in the primitive Gospel. The fragment about the Sweat of Blood could very well be a part of that text. The sentence, "And being in an agony He prayed the longer, and His sweat became as drops of blood trickling down upon the ground," is more precise in its first part, and more expressive than the minute description of St. Mark. It is quite possible that the author of the first Gospel intended to soften or modify the details of the Agony by the introduction of certain additions. We have a sort of parallel in the Epistle to the Hebrews (v., 7): "In the days of the flesh, with a strong cry and tears (Christ) offering up prayers and supplications to Him that was able to save Him from death, and being delivered from fear, learned obedience by suffering."

The apparition of the angel is really the only element which has no equivalent in the parallel narratives, and which might be referred exclusively to tradition, written or oral, such as seems to have been used by St. Luke. This apparition is a kind of compensation for the omission of the ministry of angels after the temptation, which ministration is mentioned by St. Matthew and St. Mark. Owing to the analogous character of the two facts a transposition might have been effected. But this we need hardly suppose. In both cases the divine assistance was given to Jesus; and if

the writer of the third Gospel mentioned the angel only in the supreme struggle, this does not imply that he did not admit an intervention from heaven in the wilderness, but only that he judged it more necessary to mention the fact after the Agony. When writing that the devil departed from our Lord for a time[1], St. Luke was thinking of the last struggle, and, we may add, of the last consolation; and he mentioned the strengthening by an angel in order to emphasize the latter. It would be useless and subtle, we believe, to investigate whether the angel appeared to our Saviour in a vision, or otherwise. What is meant by the apparition of the angel and the divine strengthening is clear enough; all else is matter of speculation.

To assume that this apparition was only an echo in the mind of the Evangelist of the words related in the first Gospel:[2] "Thinkest thou that I cannot ask my Father and He will give me presently more than twelve legions of angels?"—appears quiet inconsistent, since it would have induced the historian rather to suppress the mention of the angel during the Agony.

The mention of the Sweat of Blood is not to be taken as a merely metaphorical expression; it is a true sweat of blood caused by the deep and tragic emotion which seized Jesus. Returning to His disciples after having found in prayer the strength to consummate His Sacrifice, our Lord naturally repeats the advice which He had given them before: "Pray that you enter not into temptation." But they have no time to pray; the hour of trial is come.

ALFRED LOISY, D.D.

Neuilly-sur-Seine, France.

1 Luke, iv., 13

2 Matt. xxvi., 53.

WHAT SHALL BE HIS NAME?

"WHAT'S in a name?" Juliet slightingly questions Romeo because that name seems to be the only bar between her love and his. Daringly she bids him disregard his name and win her heart; and sentimental love makes Romeo abjure his name and "tear the word." It is the way of human passion: *amare et sapere vix Jovi conceditur.* But the Christian will cling to his name with undying fidelity; for he esteems it "better than precious ointment." Goethe's Faust may hold a name as sound and smoke (*Name ist Schall und Rauch*); but he does it to deceive and to hide his wicked designs. A name represents a reality, a living person, distinct from other individuals. St. Thomas says: *Ratio, quam significat nomen, est conceptio intellectus de re significata per nomen* (Summa theol., i., qu. 13, a. 4). A single name may bring up in our mind a thousand memories of joy and sorrow. "Who does not know," Cardinal Wiseman asks, "what choicest delicacies of feeling may be condensed within the small compass of a little name? How the name of *home* will bring to the exile's heart more ideas than a volume of eloquent description! How the title of child or parent, wife or sister, will stir the affections of a bereaved survivor!" What depth of affection and tenderness lay in the name *Maria* which the Risen Saviour uttered at the open sepulchre where He found Magdalen weeping! It threw the desolate heart of Magdalen into an ecstasy of joy.

The *naming* of a child is an act of importance. It is the exercising of a sovereign right which naturally belongs to parents. In the days of the Patriarchs the child frequently received a name expressing the character it should bear through life. Sometimes the name of the child was to indicate the desires and hopes of the parents concerning the little one. Generally the name was to designate the peculiarity and individuality of the child. In a few extraordinary cases God Himself gave the name, as He did to His only-begot-

ten Son on whom He conferred the sweetest and most glorious of all names—*nomen super omne nomen*—at which Name every knee should bend.

In the Old Law, the name was given at the circumcision of the child ; in the New Dispensation, the infant receives its name in the Sacrament of Baptism, wherefore it is called *baptismal* name. When the child of wrath is brought to the front where it is to be made a child of God, the priest asks of the father or of the sponsors : "What shall be his (or her) name?" The priest then accepts the name from the parents and as representative of the Church solemnly confers it on the child with the first question he addresses : "N., what dost thou ask of the Church of God?"

Though in the first centuries of the Church there may have been no law requiring the imposition of a name at the christening of a child, it is certainly of strict obligation now to give a name. *Iis qui baptizantur, tamquam Dei filiis in Christo regenerandis nomen imponitur.* (Rit. Rom.) This rubic applies likewise to adults. There is a mystical reason for the adoption of a new name in baptism. In the Sacrament the "old man" dies to sin and rises to a new life. He is regenerated and reformed in Christ ; becomes another being, and in consequence should receive another name.

WHAT KIND OF A NAME SHOULD BE GIVEN.

In the early days of the Church, converts to the true faith dropped their pagan names which were often the names of false deities, and took names from the Old Testament. Very soon baptismal names were chosen from Christian heroes, especially from the list of glorious martyrs. This grew into a custom which finally became a law among Christians. The Roman Ritual says: *Imponantur nomina sanctorum, quorum exemplis fideles ad pie vivendum excitentur, et patrociniis protegantur.* The name of a Christian saint is to remind the bearer that he should imitate the virtues and implore the protection and intercession of that saint. A spiritual relationship exists between the saint and his namesake. Rather than his birthday he should celebrate the feast

of his saint; he should know his history; possess a picture of him or a little statue; receive Holy Communion on his name's day, and thus honor, in a most special manner, the saint whose hallowed name he is privileged to bear.

A priest should strive to multiply baptismal names and thereby propagate devotion to the different saints. *Tom*, *Dick* and *Harry* claim great saints as patrons, but their number should not form the majority of Christian names in a parish. St. Chrysostom censured the custom of giving the child the name of his grandfather or great-grandfather and thus remaining in a narrow circle. The child's name should be carefully chosen and not be given at random. *Igitur nos neque quaevis nomina pueris indamus, neque avorum et proavorum et eorum qui genere clari fuerunt, nomina tribuamus, sed sanctorum virorum, qui virtutibus fulserunt, plurimaque apud Deum fiducia valuerunt.* (Homil. xxi., in cap. v., Genes.) The giving of Old Testament names is the outgrowth of Puritanism and should not be encouraged. The custom of giving more than one name which exists in some countries dates from the fourteenth century; it is not deserving of praise. One baptismal name with another added in Confirmation should suffice any young citizen in a democratic country like America.

Whilst the priest should endeavor to procure the name of a Christian saint for the child, he must remember that a Christian name is not of necessity, as there is no rigorous precept for it; and in case a father refused to present a Christian name and insisted on having his child called by an impious name, the priest could not therefore refuse to baptize the little one, but he should add *submissa voce* the name of a saint. A duty rests on the priest to prevent the conferring of names which savor of profanity or impiety. *Curet ne obscœna, fabulosa, aut ridicula, vel inanium deorum, vel impiorum ethnicorum hominum imponantur.* (Rit. Rom.) Through ignorance, not through malice, people sometimes present names of Christians who are not canonized saints, such as Stewart Parnell, Grover Cleveland, Greenleaf Whittier. In such a case the priest ought to induce them to put

the name of a saint before the other names; if it be a girl, the blessed name of Mary may be prefixed; if it be a boy, the name of St. Joseph may be used,—and if the priest should suggest his own name, he will hardly be refused this courtesy. If people present the names of George Washington, Patrick Sarsfield, Otto Bismark, Robert Emmett, Victor Garibaldi, Hermann Bachus, quietly accept them, as they contain the names of Saints George, Patrick, Otto, Robert, Victor and Hermann. According to Canon Law, names that are not Christian cannot be recorded, but the Second Baltimore Council seems to exempt from the general rule, when it decrees: *In libro baptismatum, omnia nomina recenseantur.* (No. 233). Only the *christian* name is mentioned in the liturgical prayers of the Church, and if a person has more than one christian name, the first one only is mentioned. Thus, if a funeral Mass is celebrated for Thomas Francis Brown, the priest prays *pro anima famuli tui Thomae.*

We meet among our non-Catholic brethren "christian" names that bear no trace whatsoever of Christianity. It is impossible to distinguish what they call this "christian" name, from their family name. The following names belong to some of our fellow-citizens: Pardon Bowen, Linwood Grant, Chessman Childs, Hart Payne, Potter Jenks, White Hall, Clay Carr, Marble Lee, Tallman Richmond, Watermann Mason, Dye Mont. A priest must frequently, in sermons and instructions, discourage the adoption of un-Christian names and point to the list of glorious names such as we find in the Roman martyrology. He should often and urgently repeat the teaching of the Church as given by the *Catechism of the Council of Trent:* "A name is given, which should be taken from some person, whose eminent virtue has given him a place in the catalogue of the Saints: this similarity of name will stimulate to the imitation of virtues and the attainment of holiness; and we should hope and pray that he who is our model for imitation, may also, by his advocacy, become the guardian of our safety and salvation. Hence we cannot mark in terms too strong, our disapprobation of the conduct of those who, with a perverse

industry, search for, and whose delight is to distinguish their children by the names of heathens; and what is still worse, of monsters of iniquity, who, by their profligate lives, have earned an infamous notoriety. By such conduct they practically prove how little they regard a zeal for Christian piety, who so fondly cherish the names of impious men as to wish to have their profane names continually echo in the ears of the faithful." Names of wicked men, such as Voltaire and Garibaldi, should be consigned to oblivion. *Nomen ejus non memoretur amplius. Nomen impiorum delebitur.*

Sometimes people present names which, at first sound, bear little resemblance to those of saints though in reality they are in the album of the blessed. The priest must be slow in disapproving of a name until he is certain that it is a profane one. When he comes to latinizing some names, his philological proficiencies are occasionally put to a severe trial. What similarity does *Delia* bear to *Bridgita* or *Percy* to *Peter?* It may not be altogether useless to give a list of *Christian* names that are of frequent occurrence, placing the Latin name first, and adding its various forms in English, and sometimes in German, French and other languages. All the following names belong to canonized saints, and are consequently rubrical.[1]

ADELAIDA, Adeline, Adelina, Adela, Alice, Alicia, Elsie, Else (*German*), Alix.

ADELPHUS, Dolph, Ethelwolf, Undolpho (*Italian*), Odulph (*German*).

AEGIDIUS, Giles.

AEMILIA, Emilia, Emily, Milica (*Slovak.*)

AGNES, Aggie, Nest (*Welsh*), Ines (*Spanish*), Agnizka (*Polish*).

ALEXANDER, Alex, Alick, Sanders, Sandy, Sawny, Ellick, Elshie, Alaster, Sandro (*Italian*), Leszek (*Polish*).

ALPHONSUS, Alonzo, Alfons, Lon.

AMBROSIUS, Ambrose, Brush, Emrys (*Welsh*).

1 The *History of Christian Names,* London: Parker, Son & Bourn, 1863, has been of great service in the compilation of this list.

ANASTASIA, Stasia, Anstace, Anty, Stacy.

ANDREAS, Andrew, Andy, Dandie, Iedrzej (*Polish*), Ondrej (*Bohemian*).

ANNA, Hanna, Anne, Nan, Nannie, Nancy, Nanny, Ninax, Annot. Ninette (*French*), Panni (*Hungarian*), Anusia (*Polish*).

ANTONIUS, Antony, Anthony, Tony, Antholin, Anton (*German*), Toontje (*Dutch*).

AUGUSTA, Gussie, Gustel (*German*).

AUGUSTUS, Gussy.

AUGUSTINUS, Augustin, Austin.

BARBARA, Barbara, Bab, Babie, Barbeli (*German*).

BARTHOLOMEUS, Bartholomew, Bart, Bartley, Bat, Barthol (*German*).

BEATRIX, Trix, Beatrice, Bettrys (*Welsh*), Bice (*Italian.*)

BENEDICTUS, Benedict, Bennet, Benôit (*French*), Betto (*Italian*), Dix (*German*), Benzel (*Swiss*).

BERNARDUS, Bernard, Barnard, Barney, Brian, Brine.

BRIGIDA, Bridget, Brighid, Bride, Birdie, Bid, Biddy, Delia, Lillie, Brites (*Portuguese*), Begga (*Swedish*).

CAECILIA, Cecilia, Cecily, Cicely, Sisley, Sis, Cis.

CATHARINA, Katherine, Catherine, Catharine, Casy, Kate, Kitty, Katie, Kathleen, Katty, Cathwg (*Welsh*), Thrine (*German*), Kasia (*Polish*).

CAROLUS, Charles, Charlie, Tearlack (*Gaelic*), Carlos (*Spanish*).

CAROLINA, Caroline, Carrie, Caddy, Charlotte, Lotty, Chatty, Lolotte (*French*), Lola (*Spanish*), Lottchen and Lina (*German*).

CHRISTIANA, Christina, Chrissie, Xina, Tine and Stine (*German*), Karstin (*Danish*).

CHRISTOPHORUS, Christopher, Christal, Christie, Chris, Kester, Kit, Stoffel (*German*).

CLAUDIA, Claude, Gladys,

DANIEL, Dan, Danny.

DAVID, Davy, Dave.

DIONYSIUS, Denis, Dennie.

DOROTHEA, Dorothy, Dol, Dolly, Dora, Dorinda, Torli.

EBERHARDUS, Everard, Ewart, Ebbo (*Italian*), Etto and Uffo (*German*).

EDUARDUS, Edward, Ed, Neddy, Ned, Teddy, Jornearth (*Welsh*), Duarte (*Portuguese*).

ELIZABETHA, Elizabeth, Eliza, Elspeth, Elspie, Bess, Bessie, Betsey, Betty, Lizzy, Libby, Lisa, Lischen and Ilse (*German*), Bettina (*Italian*).

EUGENIUS, Eugene, Owen, Jany, Genee, Iny.

FRANCISCA, Frances, Fanny, Fanchette (*French*), Sprinzchen (*German*), Fanulka (*Polish*).

FRANCISCUS, Francis, Frank, Cecco (*Italian*), Frenz (*Dutch*).

FRIDERICUS, Frederick, Fred, Ferry (*French*), Fritz (*German*), Fridli (*Swiss*), Bedrick (*Bohemian*).

GENOVEFA, Genevieve, Javotte (*French*), Vevay and Vefele (*German*).

GEORGIUS, George, Georgy, Geordie, Jörg and Görgel (*German*), Jerzy (*Polish*), Jri (*Bohemian*).

GERARDUS, Gerard, Garrett, Jarett, Gerrit (*Dutch*).

GERTRUDES, Gertrude, Gertie, Gatty, Tudy, Trandl and Trudchen (*German*).

GILBERTUS, Gilbert, Gilpin, Gil, Gibbon, Gipp, Gisbert and Giseprecht (*German*).

GODEFRIDUS, Godfrey, Geoffrey, Jeffrey, Jeff, Götz (*German*), Jeoffroi (*French*). Giotto (*Italian*).

HELENA, Helen, Ellen, Elaine, Eileen, Eleonor, Elinor, Nelly, Leonora.

HENRICUS, Henry, Harry, Hal, Hen.

HUGO, Hugh, Hughie, Hutchin, Hutcheon, Ugolino (*Italian*).

JACOBUS, Jacob, James, Jamie, Jake, Jem, Jemmy, Jim, Jimmy, Hamish (*Gaelic*), Jacquot (*French*), Jockel (*German*), Lapo (*Italian*), Rub (*Polish*).

JEREMIAS, Jeremy, Jerry, Judd.

JOANNES, John, Johnny, Jack, Jock, Jenkin, Jan, Hans (*German*), Janek (*Polish*).

JOHANNA, Joanna, Joan, Jane, Jone, Jenny, Janet, Jessie.

JULIA, Juliet, Gilean.

KASPAR, Jaspar, Gaspare (*Italian*).

LAURIENTUS, Lawrence, Laurence, Laurie, Larkin, Larry, Lanty, Renzo (*Italian*).

LUDOVICUS, Ludovick, Lewis, Louis, Clovis.

LUDOVICA, Louisa, Louise, Let, Alison, Ailie, Lisette, Loulou, Heloise.

LUCIA, Lucy, Luce, Lucinda.

MAGDALENA, Magdalene, Madeline, Maudlin, Maun.

MALACHIAS, Malochy, Miles.

MARGARITA, Margaret, Margery, Maggy, Maisie, Maggy, Meggy, Meg, Madge, Marget, Peggy, Gritty, Meta, Coton (*French*), Gretchen (*German*).

MARIA, Mary, Marion, Moll, Molly, Malkin, Poll, Polly, Mawkes, Mawkin, May, Mamie, Manon (*French*).

MATHILDES, Matilda, Maud, Tilda, Tilly.

MAURITIUS, Maurice, Morris, Moritz (*German*).

MICHAEL, Mick, Mike, Micky, Michon (*French*).

NICOLAUS, Nicholas, Nick, Nicol, Colin (*French*), Klaas, Klaus.

ONUPHRIUS, Humfrey, Humphrey, Humps, Numps.

PATRITIUS, Patrick, Pat, Paddy.

PAULUS, Pawl, Pol (*French*), Pal (*Hungarian*).

PETRUS, Peter, Pete, Piers, Pierce, Perrin (*French*), Picti (*Polish*), Perkin.

RICHARDUS, Richard, Ritchie, Diccon, Dick.

ROBERTUS, Robert, Robin, Rob, Bob, Bobby, Hob, Rab, Rupert, Ruprecht (*German*).

RUDERICUS, Roger, Hodge, Hodgkin, Rüdiger (*German*).

RUFINUS, Griffith.

SABINA, Binie, Binnie.

SARAH, Sally, Sal.

SUSANNA, Susan, Susie, Sukey, Sue.

TERESIA, Theresa, Terry, Tracy, Zon (*French*).

THADDAEUS, Thad, Tady, Ted.

THEODORICUS, Theodric, Derrick, Terry, Tedric, Thierry (*French*), Dietrich and Diez (*German*).

THOMAS, Tom, Tam, Tamlane, Maso (*Italian*).

TIMOTHEUS, Timothy, Tim.

WILLELMUS and GULIELMUS, William, Will, Willie, Bill, Wilkin, Guillim.

WILLELMINA, Wilmett, Wilmot, Mina, Minella, Minchen (*German*), Minka (*Polish*), Minette (*French*).

WM. STANG.

American College, Louvain.

THE CONDITION AFTER DEATH OF CHILDREN WHO DIE WITHOUT THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM.

OUR readers will not take it amiss if we reopen the question, raised some time ago by two correspondents in the REVIEW, relative to the condition of children who die without the Sacrament of Baptism.

The contention of the two parties has, we believe, its serious lesson, *quite distinct from the dogmatic value* of the subject which is under discussion. We give the opinions of several scholarly priests who explain the traditional doctrine about the limbo of unbaptized infants, and who hold that this doctrine is seriously infringed by the statements of H. J. H. We cannot print all the communications received on this subject; nor is it necessary or desirable, since the arguments are in the main repetitions of the standard doctrines of the Church. At the same time they are all an arraignment of H. J. H., in whose behalf no one has offered us any arguments, although there have been letters commending his position. However, these do not belong to the discussion.

As the Editor of the REVIEW has some partiality for H. J. H. who when the store of learned MSS. was submitted to him, offered to answer them (or, if convicted, to confess the errors of his theological ways), we had compassion on the single combatant, and instead of making him refute each adversary in turn, allowed him "a margin." This was asked, in order that he might point out how strangely fond the theological champions of the children in limbo appear to be of "windmills," which, whilst they beguile perhaps the sense of orthodoxy, are not the best measure of polemical correctness. Beyond this H. J. H. claims a few pages for a brief restatement of his case, with insertion of some landmarks for those who are shortsighted.

THE EDITOR.

I.

NOT A "VIEW," BUT DOCTRINE.

Perhaps "A View of a Doctrine?"

The answer to the query in a recent number[1] of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW on *the condition after death of children who die without the Sacrament of Baptism* elicited a very interesting discussion in the December issue of the same REVIEW. Whilst we admit with H. J. H. that Father Grant shows a want of logic in drawing his main conclusion, although presenting to us valuable material for the Catholic interpretation of the matter, still we cannot subscribe to the daring view of the former. H. J. H. asserts "that God may supply in some cases by penance to be endured hereafter, the grace which removes the guilt of original sin." Why only in *some* cases, and not in every case? He holds "the possibility of expiation after death equivalent to the baptism of desire." His proposition is: *Children who die without the Sacrament of Baptism may expiate the guilt of original sin by penance and finally attain the beatific vision.* We now contend that this thesis is *un-Catholic* as being against the common and constant teaching of the Church. Catholic theologians may differ in their opinion about the *nature* of the penalty which unbaptized children have to endure, but they are almost unanimous — we may claim a *consensus theologorum*—in maintaining that this penalty is *eternal.* Cajetan, known among theologians for his singularity of views, commented on St. Thomas (*Summa Theol.*, iii., qu. 68, art. 1), that in case of necessity the parents' desire may effect baptismal grace and remove original sin:

This is only part of his proposition, for he adds that this expiation after death must have its *incipient cause in some act or condition of this life equivalent to the baptism of desire, which the Church admits.*

Hence the grace is supplied *in some cases*, not in all, viz., where such act or condition existed before death.

[1] 1 September, 1897.

In casu necessitatis ad salutem puerorum sufficere videtur baptismus in voto parentum. By order of Pope St. Pius V. the note of Cajetan was suppressed in the Roman edition. The great Suarez calls the opinion of Cajetan *valde aliena a sensibus et dogmatibus Ecclesiae et ideo ut minimum temeraria et errori proxima.* St. Bonaventure, whom H. J. H. cites as advocating the opinion of *a vicarious desire*, remitting original sin, clearly and emphatically professes the common doctrine. *Quod ergo (parvulus) damnatur, hoc est quia privatus baptismo aquae caret gratia Spiritus Sancti, quia aliter ad gratiam non potest disponi.* (S. Bonav., N., dist. 4, p. 2.) The terms used by saints and doctors, as well as by Councils and Popes, are such as would exclude any possibility for unbaptized childen to wipe out the penalty of sin. Their lot in the next world is described as *mors perpetua, damnatio, infernus, pereunt a vita aeterna, sempiterna miseria et interitus.* Such expressions may undoubtedly give us "a right to state to a parent," if needs be, "that his child will be eternally separated from him in the next life, and denied the beatific vision, because that child did not receive the actual baptism of water or of blood."

Cajetan's proposition is that the *parents' wish supplies* the grace. H. J. H.'s proposition is that it *may procure* the grace by which the *child desires* the beatific vision.

H. J. H. certainly did not cite St. Bonaventure as *advocating* this opinion; in some cases he seems to *allow* it. The saint also says: "*Ideo baptismus aquae non sic est necessarius* quin si adsit voluntas et desit possibilitas, *non salvetur aliquis sine ipso*" (Breviloqu., P. iv., 7.)

Provided we could know that God had not been induced to sanctify the child in some other way.

From the galaxy of Catholic theologians who have written on this matter we select the two greatest doctors of the Church, St. Augustine and St. Thomas: the first one as the *testis singularis et omni exceptione major* in the doctrine of grace and its corollaries; and the Angelic Doctor who, though "neither Council nor infallible pontiff," yet is a safe interpreter of the *sensus Catholicus.* His authority at the Council of Trent was valued so highly that it was pointed out with the celebrated words: *Lege Thomam et invenies Ecclesiam.*

St. Augustine's "strong words" were occasioned by the Pelagian heresy against which he stood up as the champion of faith with the "uncompromising" doctrine of the Church, declaring there is no other way for children of being justified in Christ, and consequently there is no possibility for them to receive any subsequent grace if they die without baptism, except through the Sacrament of Baptism. "Quisquis dixerit quod in Christo vivificabuntur etiam parvuli, qui sine sacramenti ejus participatione de vita exeunt, hic profecto et contra Apostolicam praedicationem venit, et totam condemnat Ecclesiam, ubi propterea cum baptizandis parvulis festinatur et curritur, quia sine dubio creditur, *aliter eos in Christo vivificari omnino non posse*" (Epist. ad Hierom., 28.) He excludes the pos ibility of ever cancelling the penalty due to original sin. "Noli credere nec docere infantes antequam baptizentur morte praeventos, pervenire posse ad originalium indulgentiam peccatorum, si vis esse catholicus." (Lib. 3 de anima, cap. 8.) Speaking of a child that died without baptism, he says with a certain irony: "Absolvat eum Pelagius, et aperiat ei contra sententiam Domini regnum coelorum, sed non absolvit eum Apostolus, dicens: Per unum hominem peccatum intravit in mundum, et per peccatum mors." (Lib. de nat. et gratia, cap. 8) The gate of heaven shall forever shut them out from the beatific vision: "Nulla praeter baptismum Christi salus permittitur infantibus, quia infantes, si per sacramentum, quod ad hoc est divinitus institutum, in credentium numerum non transeant, in tenebris *manent.*" (Lib. de peccat. meritis, cap. 25.) The great Doctor never changed his doctrine on this point nor could he ever accept a milder view. The teaching of the Church is based on the infallible word of the Lord: "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." According to the proper sense of the words and the interpretation of the Fathers, this law of Christ is

Both St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas explain that in using such words St. Augustine was extreme: "Ut enim eos (Pelagianos) reduceret ad medium *abundantius declinavit ad extremum.*" (L. c. P. iii., c. 5 in fine.) In the same way St. Thomas says: "Sancti tal modo loquendi usi sunt, ut detestabilem redderent errorem Pelagianorum." (Quaest. disp. v. de malo. art. 2.)

to be understood *simpliciter et absolute.* We are not allowed to add a condition to it or make an exception to it, unless we know of it by special revelation. Wherefore Suarez maintains "nullum infantem decedentem sine baptismo salvari ex speciali privilegio aut dispensatione, vel saltem non posse hoc de aliquo affirmari absque speciali revelatione sine temeritate." (*Opera omnia*, xx., p. 482, Paris, 1866.) Unbaptized children were never considered as members of the Church, outside of which there is no salvation; they are and always were deprived of ecclesiastical burial and of the suffrages of the Church. St. Augustine tells us of a certain Vincent Victor who exhorted parents to offer "oblationes et sacrificia sacerdotum" for unbaptized children so as to obtain their final admission into heaven; he characterized this Vincent as a more daring heretic than even Pelagius. (Lib. de anima, cap. 9.) Whilst we should encourage a Christian mother to pray fervently that the child she is carrying may be born to God in the waters of regeneration, we cannot approve the prayers of parents who, without a special inspiration or revelation of the Lord, ask Him to work a miracle or dispense from His universal law by granting the beatific vision to their unbaptized children.

But the baptism of blood is surely recognized by the Church, though we have no revelation of its efficacy. The same is true of the baptism of desire.

Unquestionably.

Rightly so, for Vincent Victor was a *Pelagian* which indicated what he meant by his exhortings.

Let them not pray that God should admit their *unbaptized* children to the beatific vision, but that the grace of baptism by water, which enables them to enjoy the beatific vision, may be supplied before their eternal destiny is fixed.

St. Thomas voices the teaching of the Church that "the cessation of earthly life limits the acquisition of grace." Man can only sanctify his soul "dum est in via." Death is the goal of life; as the tree falls, so will it lie. The idea of H. J. H. that the soul remains in a "condition of suspense after all the bodily faculties have ceased to act" has little for its support. The words of the Offertory in the Requiem Mass, "Libera eas de ore leonis ne absorbeat eas tartarus, ne cadant

This H. J. H. surely does not deny.

But that little suffices to forbid our settling the fate of a child as deprived of the beatific vision.

in obscurum" furnish no argument for the suspension theory, as these same prayers were formerly said "pro agonizantibus" or as the Church refers to the hour of agony. (Cf. Dr. Gihr, *Das hl. Messopf.*). A flash of light at the moment of death may reveal a great deal, but we have nothing in Scripture or Tradition to warrant the assumption of a desire of baptism in those who have not received the Sacrament. If such a grace were given, all would be saved as no one would refuse the opportunity of escaping hell fire and of entering the glory of heaven. The incident related in the *Acta* of St. Perpetua is well known and generally quoted to corroborate the proofs for the existence of Purgatory. Her mother had probably been a Christian, and her brother Dinocrates had been baptized. He died at the age of seven. As he was capable at such an age of committing sin he may have been suffering in Purgatory. The fact that St. Perpetua who was older than Dinocrates was not baptized at the time she was cast into prison is explained by the predilection her father (who was and remained a pagan) cherished for his daughter, exercising over her his special care and influence.

Cf. also an exhaustive article on this subject in the A. E. REVIEW, vol. iii., pp. 185–192, which happens to be from the pen of H. J. H., who fully agrees with Gihr's interpretation, not however, excluding others.

The necessary *reductio ad absurdum* implied here might have warned the opponent of H. J. H. that he had misapprehended his statement in a very essential point.

Would be plausible if we did not know that for more than two centuries baptism was not generally administered to children. S. Perpetua and Dinocrates lived earlier.

Fourteen hundred years ago Pope Gelasius I. clearly stated the doctrine of the Church which admits of no possibility of holding the view of H. J. H. The holy Pontiff wrote "ad omnes episcopos per Picenam" (Ep. vii., Migne, *P. L.*, vol. 59, pp. 37), against the principal errors of Pelagius and says in the course of his letter: "De parvulis autem, quod asserit sine sacro baptismate pro solo originali peccato non posse damnari, satis impia, satis profana propositio est . . . . Omnibus etiam solis remissis (sc. peccatis originalibus) vitam per baptismum consequuntur aeternam; consequens est, ut solis etiam non remissis, ad vitam aeter-

nam pervenire non possint . . . . Nihil est ergo quod dicant, quod non renati infantes tantummodo in regnum coelorum ire non valeant, non autem perpetua damnatione puniantur . . . . Dicantur igitur in morte *perpetua* constituti, si non aestimentur damnati." The eternity of the punishment which follows original sin is taught in the "Pontifical declarations of Innocent III., Benedict XII., Gregory XIII., Benedict XIV., and Pius VI.

But we learn this in our catechism and no Catholic would think of questioning this doctrine. H. J. H. does not deny an eternal limbo for those who do not receive the grace of baptism.

Besides the synods of Palestine (415), Carthage (416) and Mileve (416) which were held chiefly to crush the Pelagian heresy and which explicitly teach that the penalty of original sin is eternal, the same as the ecumenical Councils of Mileve (417) and Carthage (418), we refer to the second Councils of Lyons and of Florence which expressly say, "illorum animas qui in mortali peccato vel cum solo originali decedant mox in infernum descendere, poenis tamen disparibus puniendas." Do not these words convey to us the truth which no Catholic is permitted to question that those who die with the guilt of mortal sin *or* original sin are alike debarred from heaven, but that the condition of their penalty is different? The *state* of both is the same; they are excluded from heaven, and as this exclusion is eternal in the one case, so it is in the other;—their *condition* however *in inferno* vastly differs. Scripture, tradition, popes and councils constantly repeat: "Nisi quis renatus fuerit," etc. No exception is made. Nothing, therefore, should be assumed without positive foundation against a matter which depends solely on the free will of God. The faithful should be taught the uncompromising truth of the eternal penalty due to original sin, according to the injunction of the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "Nihil magis necessarium videri potest, quam ut doce-

H. J. H. holds that if they die *without* the guilt of original sin, they are not punished by exclusion from heaven.

Precisely.

The whole argument of H. J. H. was directed against the assumption that in every case where we have no Baptism by water, its grace remains unsupplied. The penitent thief on the cross can hardly be supposed to have known anything of baptism. He made a general act of contrition which wiped out not only actual but *original sin*.

antur (sc. fideles), omnibus hominibus baptismi legem a Domino praescriptam esse, ita ut, nisi per baptismi gratiam Deo renascantur, in *sempiternam* miseriam et interitum a parentibus, sive illi fideles sive infideles sint, procreentur." (Part II., De bapt.) Baptism (or martyrdom) is the only means for children to obtain salvation. God seriously wishes that *all* come to the beatific vision (I. Tim., ii., 1–6). He must wish that the only and necessary means in the New Dispensation to attain the beatific vision be applied to all. It must be His will (voluntas seria et actuosa) that no child die without baptism. If *de facto* many *do* appear before Him unwashed in the Sacrament of Regeneration, this frustration of the necessary means should be ascribed to secondary causes which God does not prevent "ob justissimas rationes." Even for such children, God had provided by baptism; if they do not receive it, it is *per accidens;* nor does it belong to Divine Providence to remove all obstacles that all may benefit by a common decree or dispensation. Here we come to the point where we must humbly bow before His inscrutable judgments and unsearchable ways. Here we cannot easily reconcile His clemency with His justice, though adoring both. If we cannot "see through it," we must blame our limited mental capacities, but never the Infinite Wisdom. God's ways may be hidden to us, but they are most just. Children may die *sine sua culpa* without baptism, but they are not deprived of the beatific vision *sine sua culpa*, *because* they die in original sin. "Misericordiae vero divinae mensura non ab humano peti affectu debet, sed ex Scriptura et traditione." (Wirceburgensis).

And therefore suspend our judgment in individual cases.

We sincerely sympathize with the Christian mother who weeps at the loss of an unbaptized child, but we should not console her with a hope that never shall be realized. Human sorrow and grief will never mitigate the stern doctrine of the Lord: "Nisi quis renatus fuerit." We can, however, offer words of consolation based on a more solid foundation. We may direct her thoughts to the Father in heaven, who

will make her child naturally happy. For all eternity that child will thank the mother who bore it; for to be is better than not to be. The great theologians of the Church teach that unbaptized children know, love and praise God eternally; that at the general resurrection they will assume incorruptible and impassible bodies, and with them shall enjoy a happiness such as no mortal on earth could experience. And their mothers in heaven shall be conscious in God of their children's felicity and shall feel not the least grief of separation, but shall join in the universal praise that rises to the great White Throne:

The desire of union between mother and child is a God-given desire, and gratitude for the separation when there is no guilt seems a contradiction. But even if it were not so, we are never certain that the obstacle to such a union may not have been removed by the prayer of a parent or other meritorious act applied to the child and acting upon its consciousness before the eternal sentence is fixed.

"Soli Deo honor et gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen."

SCHOLASTICUS.

II.

THE FATE OF CHILDREN WHO DIE WITHOUT BAPTISM OF WATER OR BLOOD.

The December number of the REVIEW contained an article on the fate of children who die without Baptism. H. J. H. proposes in this article a theory so startling and un-Catholic that I was surprised to see it pass unchallenged in the following number. Although the writer feels that many an abler theologian would have taken the field in defence of the Catholic doctrine, had his attention been called to the article in question, nevertheless, while waiting for some better equipped champion, he presumes to submit a few arguments to show the unsoundness of the position taken by H. J. H., who advances a theory which may be epitomized in the following sentence: Catholics may believe that some unbaptized children will enjoy the beatific vision, or "no one has a right to say that all children who die without having received baptism of water or blood will be excluded forever from heaven."

The position which I take is diametrically opposed to H. J. H.—that, *every child who dies without having received baptism of water or blood, will be excluded forever from the sight of God.*

Here are a few Catholic truths which must necessarily be denied by the advocate of the theory I oppose. We were always taught to believe that death was the decisive moment for eternity, that this life is the acceptable time, the time of grace, that as soon as we cross the line that separates time from eternity, our fate will be decided forever, that after death there is no transition from the state of sin to the state of grace, and that consequently after death there can be no justification, although there may be and is room for atonement.

In Eccles. ii., 3, we read: "If the tree fall to the south or the north, in what place soever it shall fall, there shall it be." How do the Fathers Gregory, Jerome and others understand this text? They make use of it to enforce the necessity of coöperating with God's grace in this life, for if we leave this world in the state of grace, we will remain God's friends forever, but if we die in sin we can never hope for salvation.

Again, John ix., 4: "that the night cometh in which no man can work." Augustine, Jerome, Chrysostom, Cyril tell us that the night referred to in the text is death, the night which closes the day of each life.

In the schema prepared by the theologians for the Vatican Council we find a proposition which enunciates the same truths.

"Post mortem, *quae est viae nostrae terminus mox*, ad Dei tribunal sistimur, . . . neque ullus post *hanc mortalem vitam relinquitur locus poenitentiae ad justificationem.*"

Is it not clearly expressed here that this life is "the be all and the end all" for all?

The proposition is universal; it includes all, even the unbaptized children. If H. J. H. denies this, let him remember that the burden of proof rests upon him, and proceed forthwith to

But he has not the slightest notion to deny this.

show that the theologians did not intend to include unbaptized children.

But let us venture a step farther. The Council of Florence declares "that the souls of those who depart this life in actual sin or original sin *only* descend into hell."

Surely H. J. H. does not mean to defend the proposition that any one in the state of sin (original or otherwise) can enter heaven.

In formulating this decree the Church had one purpose only in view, to solemnly proclaim her teaching regarding the fate of all the departed. She speaks of two classes only. In the former she groups all who die in the state of grace, and to them she promises at once or eventually life eternal. In the latter class she places all who appear in the other world in sin actual or original. To them she holds forth no hope of salvation, but condemns them to hell "poenis tamen disparibus puniendas." With this definition before us, we cannot admit the possibility of even one unbaptized infant entering into the kingdom of heaven, without running counter to the express teaching of the Church. For then we could point to one, at least, who departed this life in the state of sin and who instead of being punished, was admitted to the enjoyment of the beatific vision, a privilege which, the Church tells us, is due to those alone who die "in charitate Dei," in the friendship of God. The doctrine embraced in this definition was not new, neither was it foreign to the spirit that has always animated the Church. St. Augustine in his 186 Epistle ad Paulinum tells us that Pelagius was compelled (in order that he could be called, in some sense of the word, Catholic), to condemn this proposition, "Children, even if unbaptized, have life eternal."

Not so, the purpose of the Florentine Council in formulating this proposition was to state the doctrine of *immediate* judgment after death. Petavius *misread* and *misinterpreted* this decree. (Consult Knoll, Perrone and others.)

The Council of Carthage, in its letter to Innocent, says: "A new and very pernicious heresy of the enemies of the grace of Christ is striving to raise its head, namely, that children, even when not renewed by the Sacraments of Christian grace, will possess life eternal."

I would call your attention to a few words of the Epistle which cut off the very last retreat of H. J. H. The Council calls these heretics enemies of the grace of Christ, "inimici gratiae Christi." Why? If the grace of Christ is not necessary for the salvation of souls, then His mission was a failure, the shedding of His blood was useless, and the whole work of the Redemption was a piece of stupendous folly.

H. J. H. supposes that some grace may be granted the unbaptized children after death and by virtue of this same grace they will realize their condition and work out their justification. The Pelagians would have hailed with joy the opportunity afforded them by this theory. For with this explanation they could have hurled back at their accusers the detested charge, and rehabilitated themselves in the eyes of all good Catholics. If they advocated the hypothesis of H. J. H., they might say to their accusers: "You call us enemies of the grace of Christ because we would admit into heaven children who die without the grace of Baptism. Do you not see that our position on this question does not necessarily make us enemies of the grace of Christ? We simply claim that a child who has not received Baptism *before its death* will not be excluded from heaven. We did not say that the child would receive no grace after death; in fact we contend that it may obtain grace after death and with it effect its justification. We would not derogate the least from the efficacy of Christ. So you see how unfairly you accuse us." The Pelagians, as a matter of fact, never made use of this line of argument. Was it because they were lacking in ingenuity or rather because it had not entered the mind of any one who claimed to be a Catholic, to deny that death was the door that shut out forever the grace of Christ? We are inclined to believe that they refrained for the latter reason.

Certainly not; but the question how death affects the child's powers of mind and will is the important point. Of this we know nothing; and hence we cannot *deny* the possibility of the child's receiving a grace which is not beyond divine mercy, nor contrary to the doctrine of the Church.

H. J. H. thinks that his theory is not only in accordance with Catholic doctrine but even dictated by Christian charity.

We fail to comprehend how any Catholic can discover a lack of charity in a straightforward, thoughtful exposition of the Church's teaching on this subject. When a parent insists on hearing the truth regarding the fate of his unbaptized child, why not proceed to show him how just God is even in His treatment of these little ones: that the beatific vision is supernatural, a free gift of God? Why not venture as far as the teaching of sound theologians will permit in expatiating on the natural happiness which may be his lot? Then indeed we will not feel the necessity of taking refuge in new, unheard-of and un-Catholic theories, even to dry the tears of a weeping parent.

Therefore we conclude that H. J. H. was wrong. Far from it being consistent with the teaching of the Catholic Church to assert "that children who die without Baptism may be admitted to the enjoyment of the beatific vision," we have shown that the very contrary is the case. Hence when pressed for a direct answer even by a sorrowing parent we must reply: "*The Catholic Church teaches that a child who dies without Baptism can never enjoy the sight of God.*"

Without the *Sacrament* of Baptism, since the grace of baptism is sometimes given without the Sacrament.

The advice of St. Augustine (de remiss. pecc. L. 1, c. 23) is as charitable to-day as it was in his time. Let us not arbitrarily promise to children who die without the baptism of Christ, eternal salvation for which we have no warrant in Holy Scripture, which is always to be preferred to human learning.

Not *arbitrarily*, for that would be arrogance and blasphemy. But let us not relegate a child to eternal privation of heaven because it did not receive the baptism of water or blood.

J. J. NASH.

III.

UNBAPTIZED CHILDREN.

In the December number of the REVIEW I ventured to publish a paper on the condition of children who die without Baptism. It was suggested by a query in the September issue about the teaching of the Church on the subject.

The article met with sharp criticism in a paper entitled "Another View," by H. J. H. In accordance with the teaching of pontifical and synodal documents as given in the book *Morts sans Bapteme*, I stated among other things, that nothing could replace the Sacrament of Baptism and that infants who die unbaptized will, in consequence, remain forever in limbo. H. J. H. takes exception to this and charges me with a want of logic in my conclusion. He maintains that "none has a right to state to a parent that his child will be eternally separated from him in the next life and denied the beatific vision because that child did not receive the actual baptism of water or of blood." H. J. H. defends his position by advancing a number of arguments which, without detriment to them, I may group in three classes. His argumentation will then run thus: No one has a right to say to a parent that his unbaptized child will be eternally separated from him, because, (*a*) it is possible that God may accept a substitute for Baptism in cases when actual Baptism could not be given. H. J. H. cites St. Bonaventure, Durandus, Gabriel, Gerson, Cajetan and others, who "allow that the desire or prayer of a parent for the salvation of a child . . . who dies deprived of the Sacrament of Baptism may effect baptismal grace which removes original sin and procures for the child entrance into heaven" (pp. 629 and 632); (*b*) God may possibly have given to the dying infant miraculous means to make an act of desire of Baptism: "Who will say," the writer asks, (p. 631) "that a child may not or can not receive, by some grace or intercession such light at the moment of death" (as was given to certain saints and even to ordinary men); because (*c*) God may afford to children who actually die without having received Baptism, "some process of satisfying the justice of God and after that of attaining the beatific vision" (p. 629).

In reply to H. J. H., for silence were equivalent to an admission of his criticism, I make bold to say "the reader will see a want of logic" (and of theology) generally and particularly in the main conclusion. And really, in place of arguments H. J. H. advances veritable suppositions, and then

because certain things might be, he concludes we should assume that they are, and that the doctrine of the Church sustains us in doing so. I will be brief, and in order to be clear, I will devote a separate paragraph to each of the three ways in which he says God may come to the assistance of infants who die without Baptism. In the course of the argumentation it will appear abundantly that my main conclusion—the eternity of limbo—is not only in harmony with the doctrine of the Church, but exacted by it.

A.

The first possibility is that a "substitute" for Baptism (p. 632) may be admitted. I assert categorically that such an admission is contrary to the doctrine of the Church. Grace is "effected" in the manner and through the channels appointed by Christ. But the Church is aware of no other channels through which grace is effected than the seven Sacraments. The Council of Florence expressly forbids us to attribute to any of the ancient ceremonies the efficacy of Baptism,[1] and adds "circa pueros vero, propter periculum mortis, . . . *cum ipsis non posse alio remedio subveniri, nisi per sacramentum baptismi*, . . . non baptisma differendum." The decrees of the Council of Trent are equally emphatic. Session V. renews the decrees of anterior Councils about the universality of original sin and the consequent universal necessity of Baptism. Session VI., *de justificatione*, c. 4, describes the process of justification as "translatio ab eo statu in quo homo nascitur . . . in statum gratiae . . . quae quidem translatio, post evangelium promulgatum, *sine lavacro regenerationis aut ejus voto fieri non potest*". In c. vii. of the same session we read: "causa . . . instrumentalis (justificationis) item est sacramentum baptismi . . . *sine quo nulli unquam contigit justificari.*" The Councils of Mileve and Carthage afford equally strong proof that the Church knows of no substitute for Baptism and the decrees of the Fathers on those two occasions are all the more apposite to the

1 Decretum pro Jacobitis; Denzinger, 603.

present discussion because the Pelagian pretension was precisely this, that even without Baptism children could enter the kingdom of heaven and live therein "beate." Had the Church admitted any ceremony that supplied Baptism when the Sacrament could not be administered, the Pelagians would have defended their position by appealing to it; St. Augustine would have mentioned it; the Councils would have explained it. But the Pelagians used no such arguments; St. Augustine rigorously excludes all unbaptized children from heaven. When the Fathers explained the Pelagian pretension to Innocent I., he replied: "Illud vero quod eos vestra Fraternitas asserit praedicare: parvulos aeternae vitae praemiis etiam sine baptismatis gratia posse donari, perfatuum est . . . qui autem hanc (vitam aeternam) in eis sine regeneratione defendunt videntur mihi ipsum baptismum velle cassare cum praedicent eos habere quod in eos creditur nonnisi baptismate conferendum."[1] H. J. H. quotes Cajetan in favor of his opinion. Cajetan was present at the Council of Trent and while the subject of baptism was under discussion, "cautiously" advanced his opinion, as Pallavicino tells us,[2] that in cases wherein a mother cannot bring forth her child alive, so that it may receive Baptism of water, her prayer and desire for its salvation, together with the sign of the cross over her, might suffice as a baptism and effect the grace of the Sacrament. Having stated the case thus, we must, in justice to Cajetan, say, that he hardly "allowed" that the ceremony would effect the grace of Baptism; he merely asked: "chi sa se la divina miseracordia accettasse un tal battesimo?" The manner in which his opinion was received by the Council must be an indication of the weight that a Catholic can attach to it. Soto attacked it outright, in the Council, as heretical. Some of the Fathers asked for its condemnation; and although the Council did not do so, because, as the Fathers said, it was outside of the matter under discussion, they affirmed, nevertheless, that for the same reason none could conclude from

1 Cf. Mazzella, *De Deo Creante*, Disp. 5, a, 6.

2 *Istoria del Concilio di Trento.* L. ix., cap. viii.

its non-condemnation that it was even "tolerable." Moreover Pius V., in supervising a reprint of Cajetan's works, expurged this opinion from them.[1] The other authorities quoted cannot be associated with Cajetan, except, perhaps, Durandus the "Doctor singularis"—in English, a freak.

B.

Although we cannot, therefore, hold that any such thing as a parent's desire or prayer may replace Baptism and produce the grace of the Sacrament, may we not believe, *salva fide*, that God Himself, in reply to prayers, infuses grace into the soul of a child that is about to die without Baptism. That such a thing may be done is what St. Bonaventure and Gerson affirm. Apropos to Gerson's opinion, Toletus[2] remarks that those who accuse him of having said anything similar to what Cajetan advanced, either never read him or did not understand him if they did. St. Bonaventure and Gerson simply ask "May we not believe that, in reply to the prayers or desire of a mother, who cannot bring forth her child alive, God will sanctify it in her womb, as he sanctified St. John the Baptist."[3] There is undoubtedly nothing contrary to revelation nor repugnant to the doctrine of the Church in this. "Licet a Deo," says Toletus,[4] "orationibus petere ut vel parvulum in vita sustentet usque ad baptismum vel ipse dignetur supplere defectum baptismi sua immensa misericordia, quae non est ulli sacramento allegata;" to which he adds the "attende tamen" that there is no certitude in the prayer; that, although God may hear the prayer, there is no ordinary law by which He should do so and that the "puer est pro non-salvo reputandus nisi oppositum revelatione constet." When therefore H. J. H. exclaims "who will say that a child may not or cannot receive, by some grace or intercession, such light" (as dying saints and sinners sometimes receive), we are quite ready to say the venturesome person who does say so will incur neither censure nor excommunication, albeit in according "such light" to an infant he

1 Ibid. 2 Com. in Sum. Theol. St. Thomae, P. iii., qu. lxviii., art. 2.
3 Pallavicino, l. c. 4 Ibid.

might excite a misgiving in the mind of Mother Church as to the nature of his theology.

C.

H. J. H. states further, we may believe, *salva fide*, that, even after their death God may infuse sanctifying grace into the souls of unbaptized infants. This is the "process of satisfying the justice of God and after that of attaining the beatific vision in the same manner as it is effected by baptism of blood." This seems to assume that martyrdom cannot avail infants unless they obtain "light" to make an act of charity (p. 628), and too, as would appear, that there is a temporal punishment due to original sin (p. 629). But both of these assertions are contrary to Catholic theology. God infuses sanctifying grace into the souls of infants who are slaughtered because of Him, for He has said "qui autem perdiderit animam suam propter me inveniet eam."[1] That there is no such thing as temporal punishment due to original sin after it is forgiven is evident from the fact that there is no guilt due to it before it is forgiven and no other penalty than the *carentia visionis*.[2] St. Thomas explains that there is no pain in limbo precisely for this reason. Mazzella, in establishing this same point,[3] has ample quotations from him. But H. J. H. insists and alleges the fact (?) that Dinocrates, an unbaptized child, actually received baptism after death. Dinocrates is out of order: he was not an infant but a boy of seven who had the use of his reason in this world. That he was baptized in limbo and that he did not make an act of desire of baptism before death are gratuitous assumptions.

But does Catholic theology allow us to believe that an unregenerated soul may receive grace even after it has entered into eternity? I think not. The catechism explains to us that this life is the time of probation and that after death no change takes place in the condition of souls. In fact, the universal belief of the Church is that after death

1 St. Thomas, II^{a}. II^{ae}., c. xxiv., I. ad 1; also *De Augustinis; De Baptismo*, art v., Th. vi.

2 *Decretal.* L., 3; tit. xlii., c. iii., majores. 3 l. c.

the time of probation is at an end. She is explicit in her teaching with regard to infants who die without baptism nor can we, in face of it, assume anything to the contrary. The declaration of Innocent III. forbids it: "poena originalis peccati est carentia visionis." The Council of Florence declares: "Illorum autem animas qui in mortali peccato vel cum solo originali decedunt, mox in infernum descendere, poenis tamen disparibus puniendas." The Councils of Mileve and Carthage ask "Quis catholicus dubitet participem fieri diaboli eum qui cohaeres esse non meruit Christi? Qui enim dextra caret sinistram procul dubio partem incurret."[1] Nor does theology afford any ground for believing that grace is ever given after death. We are taught that the particular judgment and the final sentence follow immediately after death. The arguments of theologians against the Millenarians are founded on that belief. We are taught too that the term of this life is the time of merit and demerit. The liturgy of the Church conveys the same doctrine. The Church constantly prays that we receive grace in this world in order that it may be well with us in the next. She refuses to pray for children who die without Baptism and to bury their *bodies in consecrated ground.*

It will be remarked that the various arguments upon which H. J. H. founds his opinion are not drawn from the doctrine of the Church. Some of them are contrary to it and others are independent of it. It does not follow from the teaching of the Church that in certain cases something may effect baptismal grace; that in certain cases God will work miracles, giving to infants the use of their faculties and a private revelation besides; that to avail of martyrdom infants must make an act of charity, and that if the act of charity be remiss a temporal punishment for original sin will remain; that the soul does not leave the body by a sudden act but remains after all the bodily faculties have ceased to act (and as life is *in motu* I wonder upon what ground the assertion is made); that the "ne absorbeat eas tartarus" in the requiem suggests a "mysterious power to sway the final destiny"

1 Denzinger, 387 and 66.

during the wake, etc., etc. But when authentic documents are at hand, why fly aside to consider assumptions of the kind and why try to draw conclusions which they do not warrant themselves and that are either contrary or alien to ecclesiastical doctrine. It seems to me that underlying H. J. H.'s opinion there lurks a suspicion that in limbo a soul does not satisfy its created capacity for happiness[1] and that therefore it would suffer eternally for something it could not avoid. But in limbo a soul does satisfy its created capacity for happiness[2] and enjoys perfect natural happiness. Limbo is a place "citra poenam ignis" and "expers culpae et poenae."[3]

As the Church, therefore, has learned from Christ the absolute necessity of baptism, for which there is no substitute, and she has declared that those who die without the Sacrament never enter the kingdom of heaven, and although she knows that, as long as souls are in this life Christ may sanctify them without the Sacrament, yet has no assurance that He will do so, and as her teaching by no means justifies the opinion that regeneration may take place in after life, but rather excludes it, I assert, as I did in the previous paper, that Catholic doctrine not only obliges us to conclude limbo is eternal, but forbids us to say to a parent that should he himself be saved, he will meet the soul of his unbaptized child in the enjoyment of the beatific vision. We can assure him, however, in perfect keeping with theology,[4]—and this restriction to the eternal separation between heaven and limbo should be made—that he, as blessed in heaven, may visit the soul of his child in limbo. The reason is that souls in limbo are creatures of God and dear to Him, for they never offended nor are, in any positive way, under the power of the devil or associated with him, and are therefore "intra ordinem," as are the blessed, though not as they admitted to share the happiness of God in heaven.

JAMES A. GRANT.

1 See Sept. No., p. 316-17 and Dec. p. 624.

2 Cf. Mazzella, *op. cit.* 3 Denzinger, 1389.

4 Cf. Didiot, *Morts Sans Baptême*, Lettre viii; also Mazzella, *op cit.*

REPLY.

THE GRACE AND THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM.

My statements regarding the case of children who die without the *Sacrament* of Baptism, as expressed in the December number of the REVIEW, have called forth harsh criticism from a number of readers well up in their theology. From the papers containing these criticisms, three—probably the strongest of the whole number—have been selected for answer, not because the principal objections against my view are insufficiently covered by one or the other, but because the motives and methods which the writers use in presenting them point a most instructive lesson as to what preconceived notions will effect in theological controversy. The *odium theologicum* which in former times caused most aimiable and learned men to call each other heretics because, looking at the same prism of truth, the one saw white light where the other saw the colors of refracted light, is imbedded in fallen human nature, and needs but occasion to call it forth.

I have made some marginal notes in the first two papers, which may serve as a partial answer, hoping thus to save the reader from having to follow up a lengthy treatise wherein each charge would have to be repeated in order that it might be refuted. But these notes are necessarily restricted and therefore insufficient. In the case of Father Grant's paper I had good reason to omit them altogether, partly because they would be repetitions, partly because his misconstructions of what I had actually said in my former article are so evident that they can hardly escape any attentive reader. "Scholasticus" admits the want of logic in Father Grant's previous article; this absolves me from the necessity of calling attention to the same feature in his present paper.

And now, for the sake of clearness, let me briefly state the difficulty which is under discussion.

Some time ago I had to answer the question whether the doctrine of the Church holds us to the belief "that children who die without Baptism suffer torment." I replied that the terms of Catholic theology imply that children who die without Baptism *suffer loss;* but to suffer loss is not necessarily to suffer torment, unless the sufferer *realizes the loss.* And since, according to some theologians, the soul would necessarily become conscious of this loss, and hence feel a regret and longing for the object, the enjoyment of which was the primary purpose of its faculties, I added that this penalty might, under given circumstances, through the merits of Christ, procure for the child the beatific vision. I endeavored to show how this was possible, and taking the practical case of a Catholic mother, such as had been suggested by the query originally proposed, I remonstrated against the assertion "that it would be *wrong* to soothe a parent's grief with the reflection that her child, having died by an inexorable necessity without Baptism of water, *may* some day be united with her in heaven." In other words, I contended that a Catholic may hold the possibility for such children of a condition of expiation after death—adding, lest the nature of this expiation might be misunderstood—"*which has its incipient cause in some act or condition of this life*," and which is equivalent in its effects to the baptism of desire, recognized by theologians and the Church.

From this statement, and the various reasons given in support of it, the writers of the three foregoing articles have drawn the conclusion that (1) it implied a denial of the eternity of limbo; (2) that it minimized the necessity of Baptism by water; (3) that it is equivalent to saying that souls stained with original sin can enter heaven; and (4) that the condition of *meriting* grace, which is, of course, limited to this life, is, according to my theory, to extend into the next world, where reward and punishment are meted out after the immediate judgment following upon death.

It seems puerile to have to explain in repudiating these conclusions that the eternity of limbo is not compromised by the assumption that some souls may get out of it by a

special grace vouchsafed them at the moment of death through the intercession of a devout mother or other members of the Church militant. Secondly, that the universal necessity of the Sacrament of Baptism remains entirely intact when we speak of those who are deprived of the utter possibility of obtaining it, despite the earnest will of those who have the responsibilty of procuring it for their children. Thirdly, that those who enter heaven after enduring the penalty (mitissima poena) of limbo even for a limited time cannot be said to appear in heaven with the stain of sin unatoned. For the rest it seems an entirely superfluous trouble for my critics to have undertaken the lengthy proof of the necessity of Baptism. No Catholic can soberly question the teaching of Christ, which prescribes the Baptism of water as a necessary means of salvation, just as it states that there is no salvation in any other name but His, that is to say outside of the Church.

The question is, whether there are not other means which supply to the child the grace of Baptism when every means to procure it through the Sacrament or through martyrdom fails ; and whether it is reasonable and just in such a case to say : this child is forever lost solely because we know that it did not receive the Sacrament of Baptism. I assume, of course, that those who thought it necessary to save the orthodox teaching on the subject of baptism by their deluge of arguments, do not intend to cavil about mere words where my intended meaning must have been clear from the context, for I confess that the word "grace" has been used by me not only to express sanctifying or meritorious grace but also once or twice in the more general sense of the salutary penalty which is the result of such grace.

The great teachers of the Church, such as St. Augustine, St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure admit that there are other means by which the sacramental grace of Baptism may be supplied. They sometimes appear to be inconsistent when there is question of determining the extent of the applica- of such means, and thus it happens that arguments can be drawn from their words which seemingly support opposite

views. As regards St. Augustine in particular we have the declaration of both St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure showing that they considered him extreme in his expressions (see marginal note, pag. 245), although he was perfectly correct as far as the dogmatic sense of his statements is concerned. These were made to an obstinate class of people who clung to dangerous notions about freedom in matters of faith ; or else to new converts, weak like children unable to use discretion, and to whom a strict law was necessary to keep them in the faith. But we shall see directly that in his own mind he viewed matters from a less rigorous standpoint.

There appears to be no doubt about admitting the baptism of blood as a substitute for that of water. The theologians admit its validity in the case of infants, although, as St. Thomas teaches (iii., qu. 66, 12) it requires charity, or at least attrition as a concomitant. Yet, according to the usual theory, an infant is not supposed capable of eliciting this act of charity or of forming any intention. It suffers martyrdom as it suffers death, unconscious of the cause, and without any alternative as to a free choice of life on its own part. There is really, as I pointed out in my previous article, no difference between a child dying by the persecutor's hand and a child dying from other violent or natural cause, so far as its own disposition and personal merit are concerned. It is in no wise like the baptism of desire or, what is the same, of blood in the martyr who is making a conscious profession of his faith in Christ, which faith he proves by death. The scholastics, admitting that martyrdom supplies Baptism in the case of infants, do not assign any adequate reason.

Next we have the baptism of desire. This infants are not supposed to be capable of, because they have not the use of their reason and will, such as would make them desire the Baptism of water as the means instituted by Christ for adoption into His fold.

But St. Thomas speaks also of a baptism of the Holy Ghost, by which, as he explains, is meant *a grace which*

reaches the heart and effects in it some movement of faith or of love or of sorrow for sin.[1]

Such baptism need not therefore be even a baptism of desire for the Sacrament; nevertheless it has the same effect. An example of it we have in the penitent thief on the cross. He was not baptized—at least, St. Augustin (who is the most exacting on this subject among the Doctors of the Church) takes that for granted.[2] There is no reason to assume that this penitent could have desired Baptism, or even thought of its necessity. On the other hand his death can not be called a martyrdom for the Christian faith. He died as any criminal brought to the gallows might die who, having received neither the Baptism of water nor that of desire nor that of blood, expresses sorrow for his sins. Yet this baptism consisting in an act of sorrow had the effect of procuring for him the beatific vision, and in a very short time. St. Augustin had (as might be supposed from his strong stand against the Pelagians, and the extreme statements of exclusion to which that position had brought him) serious doubts how to account for this case, for it was clearly not a baptism of blood. After much pondering "etiam atque etiam considerans," he came to the conclusion that St. Cyprian must have been right in allowing that there were other means, besides martyrdom, which could supply the defect of the Sacrament, when the Baptism of water is impossible.[3] Later on St. Augustin appears to have recon-

1 Praeter baptismum aquae potest aliquis consequi sacramenti effectum ex passione Christi, in quantum quis ei conformatur pro Christo patiendo. . . . Eadem etiam ratione aliquis per virtutem Spiritus Sancti consequitur *effectum baptismi*, non solum *sine baptismo aquae* sed etiam *sine baptismo sanguinis*, in quantum scilicet alicujus cor per Spiritum Sanctum movetur ad credendum et diligendum Deum, et poenitendum de peccatis. S. Thomas Aqu , p. iii., 66, art. 11.

2 *Contr. Donat.*, Cap. 22 in princ.

3 Baptismi vicem aliquando implere passionem, de latrone illo, cui non baptizato dictum est: "Hodie mecum eris in paradiso," beatus Cyprianus non leve documentum assumpsit; quod etiam atque etiam considerans invenio non tantum passionem pro nomine Christi, *id quod baptismo deerat, posse supplere* sed etiam fidem conversionemque cordis, si forte ad

sidered the matter, because it allowed an opening to the heretics.[1]

But how can we determine whether such a grace *can reach* little children, since these do not, to our knowledge, possess the use of those faculties by which we ordinarily elicit acts of faith or love or desire. Abstracting for a moment from the cause, primary or secondary, which could produce such effects on the child, we know that infants have actually been reached by like movements of grace. We have the case of Jeremias in the Old Testament, and St. John the Baptist on the threshold of the New Law as examples that the baptismal grace which destroys original sin may act upon the rational faculties of the child even before its birth. St. Thomas[2] himself makes a strong argument to show that the sanctification of Jeremias and St. John before their birth, took place after the infusion of the rational soul, thus emphasizing the effect of the substitute grace upon the rational faculties; and the leaping of the Baptist with joy in his mother's womb would indicate that the little heart had actually received the spark which rendered it capable of emotions such as might save a person, under other circumstances, from eternal loss of the beatific vision. In fact St. Thomas is even more plain when speaking of children who die before birth. He says that by some privilege of the divine mercy they may obtain sanctifying grace: "Non possunt pueri subjici actioni humanae, ut per eorum ministerium sacramenta recipiant ad salutem; possunt tamen subjici operationi Dei apud quem vivunt: ut quodam privilegio gratiae sanctificationem consequantur, sicut patet de sanctificatis in utero."[3]

It might be urged that the cases of Jeremias and St. John who received the baptismal grace before their birth, are special dispensations indicating their future calling as prophets. No doubt their sanctification in their mothers'

celebrandum mysterium baptismi in angustiis temporum succurri non potest." St. Aug., Lib. IV. De unico Bapt. parvul.—*Contra. Donat.*, C. 22.

1 Retract ii., 18.,

2 III., qu. 27, 2; et alibi.

3 S. Thom., iii., q. 68, art. ix., ad. 1.

wombs prepared them thus by increasing the possibilities of personal holiness as allied to, and strengthening them in, their noble vocation; but the prophetic call itself did not require such a prerogative as much as a child's soul requires salvation. God has shown that even pagans like Balaam might serve Him as prophets; whilst for personal salvation He requires purification from original sin.

Of course I have no notion to assert that the merit which procures such grace, or the grace itself can originate in the next world. When I spoke of "the *possibility* of a condition of *expiation* after death" in the case of infants who had not received the Baptism of water, I added, as mentioned before, the words "which has its *incipient cause in some act or condition of this life.*" There would have been no reason for these words if I maintained the absurdity of possible merit after death, that is, after judgment; and I had therefore no need of being overcautious in my use of the word grace when applying it in the wider and therefore less accurate sense which "sanctifying grace," excludes as theologians understand it. If my words (page 624) seemed to underrate the argument of St. Thomas, "that the cessation of earthly life limits the acquisition of grace," it was only under the supposition that it would be used, as is sometimes done, to prove the eternity of limbo for all children who die without the Sacrament.

Admitting then, as we must do, that any movement of faith or charity or sorrow *can* procure the baptismal grace even for infants, it will be asked: On what ground may some children be supposed to obtain such a grace, to the exclusion of others? In answer I mentioned, without attempting to defend particularly, St. Bonaventure, Durandus, Gabriel, Gerson, Cajetan, because they allow "that the desire or prayer of a parent for the salvation of a child, who without its own or its parents' fault dies deprived of the Sacrament of Baptism, may effect the baptismal grace which removes original sin and procures for the child entrance into heaven." I also mentioned that modern writers cite Gregory of Nyssa, Scotus and others in support of the opinion that a baptism of

desire may at the moment of death prepare the soul of the child for the beatific vision. I am told that these authors with the exception of Cajetan cannot be cited in support of such an opinion. St. Bonaventure is quoted by "Scholasticus" as saying the very opposite; and as for Cajetan, I am referred to Pallavicino to show that he was heterodox. Now I had read Pallavicino's remarks on the subject before I wrote my answer to Fr. Grant in the first instance, and it was precisely there that I found Gerson and St. Bonaventure cited in favor of the view which I said they allowed. If Father Grant will consult the very chapter which he appears to have had before him, unless his citation is at second hand, he will find (Lib. ix., cap. 8, n. 4) in the *Vera Concilii Tridentini Historia*, a text-reference to the "Sententia Gersonis putantis *interdum relaxari a Deo hanc legem* pro suo arbitratu *ad parentum preces.*" He then goes on immediately to give the opinion of St. Bonaventure, which he calls "minus laxa," namely, *id saltem contingere cum inceptus jam Baptismus ex obstaculo, sed citra culpam, aut ex occulto vitio absolvi non potest.*"[1] The baptism of which the Saint here speaks, is according to theological definition an invalid baptism, and hence does not confer grace; but the prayer of the parent, according to the judgment of Gerson, St. Bonaventure and others, would supply the grace in a case where there has been either a desire or an actual attempt to administer the Sacrament.

I have no special sympathy for the particular view which Cajetan suggests (not "cautiously" as Fr. Grant makes him do, for the word *caute* in the beginning of Pallavicino's sentence is part of Cajetan's own proposition), namely, that the parent's desire stands instead of the child's desire for Baptism, for this is slightly different from my assumption that the parent's prayer may *procure for the child* the movement of grace which will save it. But I would just suggest that any effort to discredit Cajetan as a peer among theologians next to men like St. Thomas, Suarez and others of the same grade, is overstepping the mark of just criticism. The

1 Edit. Antwerp, 1673.

present generation owes him more honest judgment, and Leo XIII., in making Cajetan the one great exponent as annotator of the typical edition of St. Thomas, has pointed the way to such judgment, without prejudice to the wise discretion of Pius V., who expunged the above-mentioned passage.[1]

But whatever we may think of the individual opinions of Cajetan or of St. Bonaventure and others, they need not be considered as arguments one way or another where there is question merely of restraining us from an unduly rigorous interpretation of our Lord's words. Truth has its own infallible force, and the words "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven," preserve (like those other words, "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you,") their complete sense, even if we admit that God provides other ways, induced thereto by special causes, such as the prayers of parents, etc., when the fulfilment of His commands to receive Baptism of water is an impossibility. There are many reasons supported by analogy of faith and practice in the Church which might incline a Catholic to admit even a *vicarious* influence producing *effects of grace and merit* upon the child at the instant when it departs this life. Do we not profess our renunciation of sin, our faith and hope and charity at the baptismal font by the lips of sponsors? And without being conscious of it, or having any intention of doing what we are pledged to do of a free will, we receive remission of that sin which our parents brought upon us. The grace, though imparted *ex opere operato*, is effective under the assumption

1 Ughelli (*Italia Sacra*, i) writes of him, at a time when personal odium no longer moved the critics to depreciate his great qualities as a peer among theologians: "Hic ille est alter Thomas, ingeniorum extrema linea, doctorum virorum miraculum, haereticae pravitatis terror, Sacrarum Scripturarum lumen ac fax, scholastici pulveris athleta invictus, Thomisticae doctrinae galeatus defensor, sincerioris doctrinae propugnaculum, arx ac promptuarium subtilium argumentorum, cathedrae demum splendor ac decus, cujus adeo immortalia scripta sunt, ut tamdiu videantur perennatura, quamdiu divinam sapientiam scholastica subsellia personabunt."

that the intention and the faith and charity of the sponsor and of the Church at large may be credited and transferred to the child which can in no way manifest its acceptance of it. "Non est enim inconveniens," says St. Thomas, "quod aliquis obligetur per alium in his quae sunt de necessitate salutis." God will surely answer the prayer of an earnest parent and supply any grace in accordance with His promise and purchase of salvation, enlightening every man who cometh into this world.[1]

Nor is there any difficulty in admitting that children who receive such a grace will have to undergo a process of purification in *limbo*, where the desire of the beatific vision would constitute some sort of atoning suffering.[2] For this baptism of desire, or faith, or charity, or suffering or whatever we may assume it to be, has not the same effect upon the soul as the Baptism of water. In the baptism of desire, according to the teaching of the Fathers, we are freed from the *guilt* of sin. In the Baptism of water we are freed from the *guilt and penalty* of sin. In the baptism of blood we are freed from all the *guilt and privative consequence of sin*.[3]

1 S. Thomas., iii., qu. 71, 1 ad 3. Vide ibid. qu. 68, art. 9, (cit. S. Aug., lib. i. de peccatorum meritis et remissione, cap. 19 circa fin.) "Si propterea recte fideles vocantur quoniam *fidem per verba gestantium* quodammodo profitentur, cur etiam non poenitentes habeantur, cum per eorumdem verba gestantium diabolo et huic saeculo abrenuntiare monstrentur?" Et eadem ratione possunt dici intendentes, *non per actum propriae intentionis*, cum ipsi quandoque contra nitantur et plorent, sed per actum eorum a quibus offeruntur.

S. Augustinus scribens Bonifacio (lib. i. contra duas Epist. Pelag. cap. 22) dicit, "*in Ecclesia Salvatoris parvuli per alios credunt, sicut ex aliis, quae in baptismo remittuntur peccata traxerunt.*"

(Ibid., art. 8 ad 3.) Dispositio sufficiens *ad suscipiendam gratiam baptismalem est fides et intentio*, vel propria ejus qui baptizatur si sit adultus, vel ipsius Ecclesiae, si sit parvulus.

2 The Church does not bury children, who have died without the *Sacrament* of Baptism, in consecrated ground, because they have not *professed* the Catholic faith and hence do not belong to the *body* of the Church.

3 In baptismo *flaminis* qui est per poenitentiam et Spiritus Sancti gratiam purificamur *a culpa*. In baptismo *fluminis* purificamur a culpa et *a satisfactoria poena*. In baptismo *sanguinis* purificamur *ab omni miseria*. St. Bonav. *Brevil.*, p. vi., cap. 7. Edit. ii., Herder, 1881, pag. 489.

It would not seem therefore so strange that there should be an end to the limbo for those children who through the intercession and merits of others obtain a grace at the moment of death by which they feel some regret for the guilt of original sin. And when their faculties enlarge and they realize more fully the cause of this privation and the mercy which hinders it from being eternal, may not the penalty, constituting a "mitissima poena," purify them for the beatific vision? And all this without prejudice to an eternal limbo for those who did not receive the help of prayer which caused the baptism of desire, or faith, or love, or sorrow of which St. Thomas speaks, and of which we have examples in Holy Writ. To say that these are exceptions is to admit what I had hoped to establish from the first, namely, that we have no right to judge that there has been no supplying grace from causes which, though unknown to us in particular cases, are not therefore contrary to the established economy of salvation. Nor are such cases to be called miracles, since we assume that they have a cause rendered adequate through the mercy of God.

H. J. H.

BIBLICAL RESEARCH.

I.—ARCHEOLOGY AND DISCOVERIES.

The New Babylonian Account of the Deluge.

THE discovery announced in the January number of the REVIEW has since been described by the discoverer himself, Père Scheil, O. P., in the *Revue Biblique Internationale* (January, 1898).

The clay tablet is in bad condition; and the text of a very fragmentary character. Fortunately the colophon—perhaps the most important part of the tablet—is preserved. This "subscriptio" contains a three-fold indication: the place of

the tablet in the complete narrative, the signature and the date.[1]

The name of the scribe is Ellit Aya; and since it is known that Aya was the goddess consort of Shamash, and that this divine couple had their principal seat in Sippara, we are led to the conclusion that we have here a poetical edition of the national and popular tradition, as current at Sippara, about the origin of the human race.

The date is "the 28th day of the month Shebat, in the year when King Ammizaduga built the fortress of Ammizaduga-Ki at the mouth of the Euphrates." Now the date of Ammizaduga's reign is about 2140 B. C. This is respectable antiquity. Still, the tablet contains the well-known expression *Nibish*, *i. e.*, "effaced," which shows that it is only a copy of a more ancient original. "No one can say," remarks Père Scheil, "how many centuries one must go back before reaching the historic fact which lies at the base of this cycle of legends and the first narration made of it."

Père Scheil refrains from making any definite comparison between the contents of the new tablet and the previously known traditions. In fact, it is such a fragmentary bit,—only large enough to assure one that the tablet contained the story of the *Deluge* in a *poem* full of *polytheistic* and *mythical* details. But Dr. W. H. Ward, who took the initiative of asking P. Scheil for an account of a discovery which he rightly thought would prove interesting to the American Biblical student, insists on the great importance of this memorable discovery, from which we learn positively that the story of the Deluge was well known to the common people of Babylonia, and to all the East from Syria to Persia. This find completes the discovery by George Smith of a poetical account, regarding the Deluge, on tablets in

1 This document (of 439 lines) was the second chapter in a story which had for its title *While the Man Rested*, and consequently a story quite distinct from that preserved for us in the previously discovered version of the Deluge, which formed the eleventh chapter of another legend beginning with the words "They see a source."

King Assurbanipal's library at Nineveh,[1] since it gives an idea, though incomplete, of the original Babylonian tablets, from which the relatively recent (7th cent. B. C.) Assyrian copies of the Nimrod Epic were likely derived.[2] There are, however, in this new fragment passages which have no equivalent in Assurbanipal's tablets. So our Sippara edition was a redaction entirely different from them, though recording substantially the same form of the legend about the Flood that was current for centuries in Assyria and Babylonia.

The problem remains: Does the Biblical narrative represent the primitive form subsequently corrupted by mythological and polytheistic accretions, or is it rather the divinely purified and monotheistic version of an older popular tradition?

II.—PENTATEUCH CRITICISM.

1. An important study is contributed to this subject by Père Lagrange, O.P., the Superior of the Biblical School at Jerusalem. His paper, entitled *Les Sources du Pentateuque*, was well received by the Catholic savants of the late International Scientific Congress of Freiburg, and is reproduced in the January number of the *Revue Biblique*.[3]

1 George Smith († 1876) was the first to recognize several of these fragments in the British Museum (1872), and he discovered some others in the excavations made by himself at Nineveh. Prof. P. Haupt has published a carefully prepared edition—*Das Babylonische Nimrod-Epos*, 1884–1891—(Cf. *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*) of which a new edition will soon be issued.

2 Translations have been given by Smith, Oppert (1885), Lenormant, Haupt (1884–1891), Loisy, Sauveplane (1893). Maspéro (1896); Cf. Loisy's *Les mythes Chaldéens de la Création et du Déluge*, (1892). The last work on this legend by F. de Moor: *La Geste de Gilgames confrontée avec la Bible et avec les documents historiques indigènes* in *Le Museon et La Revue des Religions*, 1897, attempts to explain all the details of this epic as symbols of facts belonging to Chaldean history. Such interpretations are apt to be fanciful. He thinks (p. 481) that there is sufficient similarity between the narrative of the flood in Genesis and the same in the eleventh tablet of the Nimrod Epic, as to make their common origin from a primitive tradition a certainty, admitting that the Bible represents the best form of this primitive tradition.

3 A lengthy summary of it is found in the current *Catholic University Bulletin*. It is the first of a series which the authors intend to publish on this subject.

Father Lagrange begins with a historical sketch of Pentateuch criticism, quoting the two Catholic critics, Father Richard Simon and Dr. Jean d'Astruc, as the initiators of a study which unfortunately was afterwards carried on almost exclusively by Protestants and Rationalists. Then, as one above all concerned with Catholic interests, and deeply imbued with reverential spirit for tradition, he examines the limits within which a Catholic should confine himself in the study of Biblical criticism. He deals first with a preliminary question, answering five objections, which have thus far—without sufficient reason he thinks—prevented Catholics from entering fully into this study.

(1) A false idea about the composition of the Sacred Books. Assuming that the manner of Oriental composition must have been the same as that of classical literature, Greek or Roman, many theologians have based upon that misconception a theory of canonicity and inspiration which obliges us to attribute to the original author the final redaction of a Biblical book. Such is not the fact. Inspiration is compatible with any literary process, not excepting those usually employed by Orientals of remodeiling and developing books already existing. The dogma of inspiration is safe, if we admit that the last redactor was inspired, even if his documents were not.

(2) The fear that we could not safely admit that some of the laws of the Pentateuch belonged to a period later than Moses, in other words that the Biblical account represented an evolution of said laws, by which theory innumerable contradictions will readily disappear from the Sacred Text.

(3) A third difficulty was the testimony drawn from the Bible itself. The Bible nowhere says that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, nor should the authority of our Lord be adduced in such matters, as He did not pretend to solve for us literary problems. In John v., 45–47, He simply opposes the written books of the Law, known to all under the name of Moses, and His own spoken word.

(4) The strongest difficulty is *Tradition.* On this delicate point Père Lagrange appears to present a decisive solution

of the difficulty. Reproducing a luminous distinction indicated by Abbé Loisy[1], he says:

"Moses is the legislator of Israel; Mosaism is at the bottom of the whole history of the people of God—such is the *historical* tradition. Moses was the redactor of the Pentateuch which we possess—such is the *literary* tradition." That the defenders of the Mosaic authorship overlooked this simple distinction, he attributes to the fact that tradition being attacked indiscriminately, Catholics first answered indiscriminately before attempting a critical work. But while we must defend the *historical* tradition and maintain the undeniable fact that only one name—that of Moses—explains Judaism and its history, the case is very different with regard to the *literary* tradition. Some of the Fathers have merely followed an existing Jewish tradition, asserting numerous doubtful details. To admit a distinction between Apostolic tradition and the recording of Jewish opinions does not infringe upon the decree of the Council of Trent laying down a disciplinary rule by naming the Pentateuch of Moses; the Pentateuch will ever remain the Pentateuch of Moses, in the sense that he laid the foundations of legislation.

(5) The last objection is the historical value of the Pentateuch. Père Lagrange points to the current mistake of basing the veracity of the Pentateuch upon its Mosaic authorship. For, if a narrative posterior by several centuries to the facts related, be totally unworthy of credence, then no amount of Mosaic authorship would of itself save the historic character of the patriarchal history. On the contrary, if we admit the composite structure of the Penta-

1 "The Pentateuch, in the state in which it has reached us, cannot be the work of Moses. We still attempt to prove the Mosaic authorship of the entire Pentateuch, and we employ for this purpose arguments which are not sufficiently conclusive, since they do not truly rest upon the analysis of the texts. We could prove with greater ease and more fruit, that Moses, whatever may be his share in the composition of the Pentateuch, really existed; that he is the indispensable founder of the Jewish religion, the historic starting-point of the great religious movement which culminates in Christianity." *Enseignement Biblique*, Nov.-Dec., 1893, p. 6-7.

In 1893, few accepted Loisy's idea, the question not being yet mature.

teuch, we have, to insure the veracity of Israel's history, three witnesses instead of one—something similar to the case of the Synoptic Gospels. The Pentateuch is indeed historical —but, above all, doctrinal ; in it history is but a framework intended to prefigure the New Law. It was written according to historical processes foreign to our habits, but under the divine direction of the Holy Ghost.

2. Père Lagrange is not alone in this field of criticism. Immediately after the Congress of Freiburg in August, Catholics in England started a study of that important question, never yet systematically treated by any Catholic scholar. Between October and January the London *Tablet* published a series of articles on the *Attitude* or rather *Attitudes of Catholics towards Pentateuch Criticism*. Dr. R. Clarke, well known for his articles on Inspiration, published in the same paper (1892), gave a thorough treatment of the question. He distinguishes the factors in the Pentateuchal discussion as theological, literary and historical. Leading off from the theological factors, he urges that these are contained in the view of Scripture inspiration which follows from the Patristic principle of the *οἰκονομία*—which view is unmistakably that of the disciplinary Encyclical on *Scripture Studies*. He maintains that, whilst the Scriptural writers were fully inspired in writing whatever they wrote, yet they were not fully enlightened with respect to the whole ulterior meaning intended by the Holy Spirit. They never wrote any erroneous statement under inspiration, but they believed like their contemporaries, expressed themselves in the language employed by their contemporaries ; and with regard to style, art, archæology, science, and above all, *history*, followed the literary methods of their time and country. The question thus arises : What was the ancient method of history-writing ? The nature of this method is discussed ; and the result arrived at is, "that it was quotative as distinguished from elaborative, and ordinarily without references or other express marks of quotation, thus throwing the reader on internal evidence for the discrimination of the documents made use of ; and that it was, therefore, not necessarily one

of self-committal to every detail quoted; and that it carried with it a greater freedom than is now assumed in the reporting of speeches and as to the writing in the name of another." This is only what we should naturally expect, were not our minds accustomed to the later elaborative methods of writing, which lead us to read the Hexateuch anachronistically. On these principles, according to Dr. Clark, rests the document theory propounded by the critics: "The extensive work which was drawn up as a Hexateuch, and has come down to us as the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, has been compiled or redacted from antecedent documents, which (in the form in which they have reached us in the compilation) are either ordinarily or altogether later than Moses, so that Moses is not their total, specific and immediate, but their partial, generic and remote author." Here our author describes the positions held by the critics "as the critics themselves held them," (which is not always the case with text-books and so-called apologetic treatises), remarking that, on account of the complicated character of the theory, "it is almost infinitely improbable that it is either altogether false or altogether true."

More than one redactor had part in that compilation: "The documents in question were the result of the activity not of simple individuals, but of schools, which taken together summed up the various phrases of the spiritual life of the nation." He further describes the character of the schools, the priestly and the prophetic, and the characteristics, as well as the dates, of the several documents of which they were the expression.

Of course the critics do not agree on all the details, but it would be a mistake and an anachronism to make merry over their discussions. Do the defenders of the original unity of the Pentateuch agree as to the grounds of their defence? Moreover, an impartial investigation will no doubt induce the conviction that, leaving aside all tentative hypothesis, a very substantial unanimity has long since been reached on the main features of the case. Besides the special and interesting question of Pentateuch criticism, other questions more

general are involved in that problem, as, for instance, the nature of inspiration, the relation between inspiration and authorship, the kind of truth which belongs to Biblical statements, etc.—the treatment of which pre-supposes a mass of facts and details.

3. Prof. Hommel's recently (May, 1897) published volume, *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition as Illustrated by the Monuments*,[1] has received from different quarters rather severe criticism. Prof. Driver, in a note to the new edition (the 6th) of the *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (p. 158), says that, as a refutation of the critical position, Hommel's work is a failure, because "the author makes no attempt to distinguish logically between fact and imagination, and what he really brings into the field against the conclusions of critics are not facts attested directly by the monuments, but a series of *hypotheses* framed indeed with great ingenuity, but often resting upon the slenderest possible foundation, and most insufficiently supported by the data actually contained in the Inscriptions." In fact his erudition is more abundant than sure; and, though the materials contained in his book are very valuable, the hypotheses built upon them are often more ingenious than solid. Despite these defects, the book is likely to mark an epoch in criticism, on account of the precise distinction drawn between the literary side of the composite structure of the Pentateuch and the historical view taken by the critics which Hommel refuses to share.

III.—HISTORY OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

1. Dom Calmet has been the subject of two interesting studies. Dom Besse, O.S.B.,[2] gives a biographical sketch of the illustrious Benedictine, insisting upon his method of work and his extensive knowledge in the field of Bible study.

E. Nourry[3] exposes the ideas of Dom Calmet about the

1 The book was published simultaneously in German and English.

2 *Revue du Clergé Français*, 15 Dec., 1898.

3 *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne*, Nov., Dec., 1897.

scientific data of the Bible, as well as his way, both conservative and critical, of treating the miracles of the Bible.

Another Biblical scholar of the same period concerning whom a good monograph would be desirable, was the Scotch Alex. Geddes, a Catholic priest, who died in 1802.

2. Both of these scholars followed the traces of Richard Simon, the learned Oratorian of Paris, so justly called the Father and Founder of Biblical criticism. A historical sketch of truly dramatic interest has just been published by Henri Margival: *Richard Simon et la Critique biblique au XVIIème siècle.*[1] The preparation of R. Simon for his Biblical studies is treated in a masterly way; but better still are the two articles about Simon's first book, *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament.* Because he was bold enough to contend that Moses could not possibly have written the Pentateuch as it is, and to protest against the excesses of dogmatism theological, exegetic, Judaistic, Protestant, or rationalistic, he was accused and condemned; and his books were suppressed by royal authority. Not only Bossuet but all his contemporaries were opposed to his method of historical exegesis. They thought that criticism was a danger to traditional dogma; and Simon was considered and treated as a public nuisance. His love for Scripture, shown in his ardent spirit of investigation, was deemed heresy—"the only accusation," said St. Jerome, "to which it would be impious to remain indifferent."

Fortunately, better days are in sight for this historical method, the only one, said R. Simon, which could well explain the Bible—a human though divine book—and maintain the essential method of Catholic exegesis—the traditional interpretation. It is to be regretted that such critics as Sainte-Beuve, Lanson and Brunetière, who claim to be independent, have endorsed the judgment of Bossuet; and more than one text-book associates the name of R. Simon with those of Strauss and such other erratic scholars.

3. Dom Gasquet relates the sound work in textual criti-

1 *Revue d' historie et de littérature religieuses*, 1897.

cism which characterized the studies of the thirteenth century in England.[1] Following Samuel Berger, he gives a history of the attempts made in that century by Englishmen to secure a purer text of the Latin Vulgate version of the Bible. He gives special attention to the work of Roger Bacon, and to that of the great Biblical critic who wrote the *Correctorium Romanum*, and whom we now know as Friar William de la Mare, showing how the result of the labors of these critics and others in the thirteenth century was to increase the reverence due to the Bible, and to make it better known.

4. If we go back to a still earlier period of history, we find Biblical criticism honored in the Church and practised with wonderful freedom. Such is the impression left by two remarkable articles from the pen of Jean Lataix: *Le Commentaire de S. Jerome sur Daniel.*[2] The opinions of St. Jerome, but especially those of Origen, are fully explained, showing there is hardly anything new in the modern interpretations of the book of Daniel. From the diversity of opinions among the Fathers quoted by St. Jerome, respecting the interpretation of the seventy weeks of years (Dan. ix.), it is evident that no one has a right to stamp as traditional the view commonly taken that this passage has a necessary reference to the date of our Lord's Death as to be reckoned from a decree (which?) of Artaxerxes (which?).

IV.—TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND EXEGESIS.

We, too, nowadays can boast of our own critics.[3]

1. Fr. Touzard, S.S., Professor of Holy Scripture and Hebrew at the St. Sulpice Seminary, Paris, has just pub-

1 *Dublin Review*, Jan., 1898. English Biblical Criticism in the Thirteenth Century.

2 *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses.* Mars, Avril, Mai, Juin, 1897.

3 A warm appreciation of the work of Catholic scholars is to be found in the *Theologische Literaturblatt*, Leipzig, nos. 50 and 51, from the pen of Prof. König, of Rostock—though the account is too much confined to the work of German Catholics.

lished, under the title *L'original Hebreu de l' Ecclesiastique*, a series of articles contributed to the *Revue Biblique*[1]. It is a study of the original Hebrew of a portion of Ecclesiasticus (xxxix., 15 to xlix., 11), contained in eleventh century manuscripts which were discovered partly by Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, partly by Prof. Sayce, and edited by A. E. Cowley and Neubauer.[2] We have no hesitation in recommending Fr. Touzard's work as a model of solid erudition, penetrating criticism, patient investigation and exact appreciation of the flood of light which this capital discovery sheds over the most vital and important Biblical questions, such as the history of dogma among the Jews, the history of the Canon of the Old Testament (*v. g.*, strong arguments derived from the silence of the manuscripts about Daniel, as to the late date of this prophet), the history of Hebrew writing, the characteristics of the Hebrew language of the second century B. C., and consequently the history of the composition of the Sacred Books (*e. g.*, the so-called Maccabean Psalms), as the textual criticism and the value of the versions of the Bible. We wish that every non-Catholic scholar would read that study and judge the fairness of our Biblical criticisms. That would be the best answer to the impertinent remark of Prof. Cheyne[3]: "Whether Biblical criticism can flourish in the Catholic Church remains to be seen."

2. Abbé Loisy contributes a remarkable article to the *Revue d'hist. et de litterat. religieuses* (Sept.–Oct., 1897), on Gen. iv., 26, (Enos) "cœpit invocare nomen Domini." This statement seems to go against what is plainly asserted elsewhere, that Enos' uncles, Cain and Abel, as well as Adam and Eve, had "called upon the name of the Lord." Interpreters have always been at a loss to reconcile those two statements. According to Loisy, the Judaistic writer (y2) who has placed Enos in the third rank of the Sethite genealogy, has inserted this phrase here because he had found it

1 April, October, 1897, January, 1898.

2 *The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus*, Oxford.

3 *Academy*, Jan. 1896.

connected with the name of Enos in the source (oral or written) from which he derived this name, and in which it designated (meaning *man* as well as Adam) the first man, whence it was but natural that Enos should be the first worshiper of God. More than one difficulty will be solved by recurring to the composite structure of the Hexateuch.

Apropos of this verse, Abbé Loisy gives his idea about the genealogies contained in the first chapter of Genesis. They represent not so much a series of individual persons, as an idea, viz., the unity of the human family, just as the genealogies of our Lord in St. Matthew and St. Luke exhibit less a complete list of ancestors than an apologetic idea—the Messianic title of Jesus based upon his descent from David. This explains why the genealogies given by the two Evangelists may differ and yet be consistent with facts.

3. Dom Morin, O. S. B., who succeeds almost every year in bringing to light some hitherto unknown patristic writing, has published (*Rev. Biblique*, Apr., 1897, and *Revue Benedictine*, Sept. 1897), a fragment from the Dacian Bishop (Vth Century) St. Nicetas *De psalmodiæ bono* in which the following note is prefixed to the Magnificat: "Cum Helisabeth Dominum nostrum anima nostra magnificat" (Vatican MS. 5729).

4. This reading, says F. Jacobé (*Revue d'histoire et de literature religieuses*, Sept.-Oct.) is found also in the three most ancient MSS. of the pre-hieronymian Vulgate: a. Vercellensis; b. Veronensis; c. Rhedigerianus; which read "Et ait Elizabeth," instead of "Et ait Maria." The discrepancy was not unknown to Origen, who alludes to it in his VII. homily in *Lucam*: "Non enim ignoramus quod secundum alios codices et hæc verba Elizabeth vaticinetur"; but he expresses no opinion as to the critical value of this reading. M. Jacobé explains the divergence as follows: In the primitive text no proper name was prefixed to the canticle which was introduced merely by the formula "Et ait." Afterwards some added "Maria," others "Elizabeth," because the Magnificat suited the Precursor's mother hardly less than the Redeemer's, and the canticle was in great part an adapta-

tion of Hannah's Song. (I. Sam. ii., 1–10.) This explanation removes the awkwardness of Luke's expressions: *And Mary abode with her* (1., 56), which follow the Magnificat, and seem to imply that the person speaking before was not Mary herself but Elizabeth with whom she remained. M. Jacobé next explains how the reading *Maria* prevailed. Forcible and ingenious as are his reasoning and explanations, his conclusion is very cautious and moderate, his object being rather to raise the question than give its solution.

5. Fr. A. Durand, S.J., in *Revue Biblique*, Jan., 1898, answers the preceding article. He emphasizes the idea that the Messianic meaning of the Magnificat is more fully realized in Mary; the external evidence seems to him overwhelming, especially as Origen, the most eminent of Biblical critics, has discarded this reading; it is but one of those many cases wherein the Western texts differ naturally from the Eastern, which critics generally prefer. Fr. Durand's article does not take up all the arguments of Jacobé, and overlooks the fact that greater weight is now given by critics to the Western texts.

6. The most remarkable fact in recent criticism of the *Acts of the Apostles*, is the increased importance attached to the "Western Text." The latest work of Prof. Blass in this line of research is an attempt to determine what he believes to have been the primitive and Lukan form of the Western text of the Acts. This "Western Text" he calls Roman, thinking St. Luke wrote it in Rome when the companion of Paul's imprisonment there.

Dr. Blass's theory that Luke wrote two distinct texts of the Acts, first a longer—the "Roman" or Western—and later on the shorter or Eastern—is familiar to Biblical scholars, and finds a growing number of adherents. Still it finds a notable opponent in Prof. W. Ramsay,[1] who proposes the following distinction. A high historical value, he says, indeed, belongs to many passages of the Western text, so that it

1 *Expositor*, Jan. 1898. In his admirable *St. Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen*, passim.

cannot have originated purely from a corruption of the Eastern. But it does not follow that Luke gave two editions of his book, and that both the Eastern and Western text are Lukan in their present form. For in several sentences the Eastern text does not seem to have a Lukan form, but seems rather to be a corruption of the original form, whilst on the other hand, the Western text contains many passages in which it is distinctly late and corrupt. "The non-Lukan variants may have originated either through an accidental process of corruption, or through intentional alteration at the hand of an editor or reviser. . . . As a work of literature there cannot be any question that the Eastern text is a far finer work, and Luke's claim to rank as a great or charming writer can be rested with much more confidence on the Eastern text."

JOSEPH BRUNEAU, S.S.

St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y.

ANALECTA.

APPROBATIO CONSTITUTIONUM RELIGIOSARUM SORORUM A SANCTO IOSEPHO IN FOEDERATIS AMERICAE SEPTENTRIONALIS CIVITATIBUS.

LEO PP. XIII.

Ad Perpetuam Rei Memoriam.

Romanorum Pontificum praedecessorum Nostrorum vestigiis insistentes, spirituali religiosarum familiarum bono consulimus, et quae in ipsarum incrementum cedunt praestare in Domino satagimus, quippe qui probe novimus Ecclesiam Dei plurimis atque uberrimis ex impigro earum studio fructus percipere. Harum in numerum iure et merito recensendam esse existimamus Congregationem Religiosarum Sororum a sancto Iosepho nuncupatarum, quae orphanos excipiunt, aegrotis ministrant, egenos adiuvant, aliaque innumera pietatis caritatisque opera in Foederatis Americae septentrionalis Statibus exercent. Haec Congregatio in Gallia primum instituta anno MDCL. ab Aniciensi Antistite de Maupas et a Patre Médaille Societatis Iesu, celebri divini verbi praecone, in plures nationis illius dioeceses brevi se protulit. Anno vero MDCCCXXXVI., Archiepiscopi Lugdunensis iussu, nonnullae illius Instituti sorores ad dioecesim sancti Ludovici iu Foederatis Statibus septentrionalis Americae navigarunt, aliae postea Philadelphiam, novaque inde exorta dictis in Statibus Sororum sancti Iosephi Congregatio, cuius princeps domus apud Chesnut-Hill in archidioecesi Philadelphiensi erecta existit, et pias multas domos pluribus in Americae dioecesibus in praesentia enumerat. Hae sorores ad annum usque MDCCCXC. antiquis usae sunt regulis, sed quum ob novas temporum ac locorum conditiones veteres regulae nonnullis immutationibus indigerent, Reli-

giosae ipsae Sorores sui Instituti regulas sedulo studio emendatas anno MDCCCXCI. ad hanc Sedem miserunt apostolicam approbationem enixis precibus expostulantes; Nosque, re tradita, prouti de more, peculiari Commissioni sub praesidentia dilecti Filii Nostri Camilli S. R. E. Diaconi Cardinalis Mazzella[1], Constitutiones eius Instituti, quibusdam inductis mutationibus, ad triennium per modum experimenti probandas censuimus. Nunc autem, elapso praefinito triennii spatio, quum memoratae Sorores iteratis precibus Nos efflagitaverint, ut definitivam earumdem Constitutionum approbationem concedere dignaremur, simulque dilectus Filius Noster Iacobus S. R. E. Presbyter Cardinalis Gibbons ex dispensatione Apostolica Archiepiscopus Baltimorensis ac Venerabiles Fratres Archiepiscopus Philadelphiensis et Episcopus Novarcensis, peculiaribus ipsam Congregationem laudibus prosequuti, earumdem piarum Sororum preces amplissimis suffragiis roborarint, Nos piis huiusmodi votis annuendum existimavimus.—Itaque omnibus rei momentis attento ac sedulo studio perpensis cum supradicto dilecto Filio Nostro Camillo S. R. E. Cardinali Mazzella et Commissione cui praeest pro revisendis Constitutionibus Institutorum religiosorum, haec, quae infra scripta sunt, decernimus, mandamus, edicimus.

Nimirum omnes et singulos, quibus Nostrae hae Litterae favent, peculiari benevolentia complectentes, et a quibusvis excommunicationis et interdicti, aliisque ecclesiasticis sententiis, censuris et poenis, si quas forte incurrerint, huius tantum rei gratia absolventes et absolutos fore censentes, Societatem seu Institutum Religiosarum Sororum a sancto Iosepho nuncupatarum, cuius domus princeps apud Chesnut-Hill in archidioecesi Philadelphiensi Statuum Foederatorum Americae septentrionalis existit, motu proprio atque ex certa scientia et matura deliberatione Nostris, deque Apostolicae Nostrae potestatis plenitudine, praesentium vi, approbamus,

1 Duplex est Commissio pro revisione et approbatione Novorum Institutorum, eorumdemque Constitutionum: altera, Praeside Emo Card. Gotti; altera, Praeside Emo Card. Mazzella, pro iis regionibus quae a S. C. Prop. Fidei dependent.

eiusque Constitutiones seu Regulas iuxta exemplar, quod anglico idiomate exaratum in tabulario Secretariae Nostrae Brevium iussimus asservari, cuius initium "*Part I.—Of the Nature of the Congregation*" est, ac postrema verba "*receive the eternal recompense*," eadem Nostra auctoritate et similiter tenore praesentium confirmamus, iisque Apostolicae sanctionis robur adiicimus. Decernentes has Nostras Litteras firmas, validas et efficaces existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri et obtinere, illisque ad quos spectat et spectare poterit in omnibus et per omnia plenissime suffragari, sicque in praemissis per quoscumque iudices ordinarios et delegatos iudicari et definiri debere, atque irritum et inane si secus super his a quoquam quavis auctoritate, scienter vel ignoranter, contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus Apostolicis, ceterisque speciali licet atque individua mentione et derogatione dignis in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque. Volumus autem, ut praesentium litterarum transumptis, seu exemplis etiam impressis, manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis, et sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis, eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus, si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die xxix. Februarii MDCCCXCVI., Pontificatus Nostri anno decimo nono.

C. *Card.* DE RUGGIERO.

DECRETUM S. CONGREGATIONIS

DE PROPAGANDA FIDE PRAEVIUM APPROBANS EASDEM CONSTITUTIONES.

Cum Superiorissa Generalis Sororum, quae a S. Josepho nuncupantur, quorum domus princeps est in Chestnut Hill apud Philadelphiam, cum suis consiliariis humillime postulaverit a SSo D. N. Leone Divina Providentia PP. XIII. ut

sui Instituti Constitutiones iam ad triennium per modum experimenti adprobatas confirmare dignaretur: cumque Episcopi, in quorum Dioecesibus praedictarum Sororum domus habentur, uberrimos ex iis Constitutionibus fructus latos esse affirmaverint: Sanctitas Sua in Audientia diei xix. Novembris 1895, referente infrascripto Sacri Consilii Christiano Nomini Propagando Secretario, praedictas Constitutiones, quibusdam tamen correctionibus, modificationibus ac emendationibus insertis prout in adiecto exemplari anglica lingua exarato continentur, benigne adprobare ac confirmare dignata est, et praesens Decretum expediri mandavit.

Datum Romae ex Aedibus S. C. de Propaganda Fide die xx. Novembris an. MDCCCXCV.

M. *Card.* LEDOCHOWSKI, *Pref.*
A. *Archiep.* LARISSEN, *Secr.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE EPISCOPORUM ET REGULARIUM.

NON CONCEDANT EPISCOPI LICENTIAS BINANDI, ABSQUE RECURSU AD S. SEDEM.

Emi Patres: Post Benedictinam Constitutionem *Declarasti Nobis*, communis esse videtur theologorum sententia, qua necessitatis casus ad Missam eodem die iterandam is in praxi reputetur, quo Presbyter duas Paroecias habet et in alterutram nequeat populus convenire, nec alius praesto sit Sacerdos, praeter Parochum, qui Missam valeat celebrare.

Nec absimilis ad hunc effectum reputatur etiam casus, quo Parochus, etsi minime praesit duabus Paroeciis, vel duos regat populos adeo inter se dissitos, ut alter ipsorum Parocho celebranti nullatenus adstare valeat ob maximam locorum distantiam, vel tametsi una tantum sit Ecclesia in qua Missa a Parocho iteranda sit, universus tamen populus in ea simul adesse non possit.

Nunc autem, cum ad Malacitanam Sedem nuper translatus fuissem, consuetudinem inveni, vi cuius aliqui Sacerdotes diebus festis bis Sacrum conficiunt: semel in Ecclesia cuius-

dam Civitatis, ubi et alii adsunt Sacerdotes, et diversa Sacra Templa, Paroeciae, et Sanctimonialium Monasteria erecta inveniuntur; et iterum in Oratorio surbano vel rurali.

Item, aliquis Sacerdos rem divinam iterato facit vel in eadem Civitate, et fortasse in ipsamet Ecclesia in quam etiam alter celebrat Sacerdos.

Pro huius binationis causa adducitur paucitas Sacerdotum; convenientia distinctae celebrationis horis distinctis, ut commoditati fidelium fiat satis; necnon et necessitas celebrandi Missam Parochialem in Paroeciis, et Conventualem in Monasteriis.

Cum igitur de huius agendi rationis liceitate dubitem, ad hanc Sacram Congregationem confugio, dubiaque mea et postulationes admodum reverenter exponam

I. An liceat Episcopo licentiam binandi concedere Presbytero unam Missam celebranti in Oratorio suburbano vel rurali, aliam vero in Civitate vel loco ubi etiam adsint alii Sacerdotes Sacrum facientes.

II. An liceat huiusmodi licentiam concedere Presbytero ambas Missas celebraturo in diversis Ecclesiis eiusdem Civitatis vel loci in quo et alii Sacerdotes celebrant, et hoc etiam si una ex Missis celebranda sit in ipsa Ecclesia in qua et alius Sacerdos Sacrosanctum Sacrificium eadem die litat.

III. An expediat Episcopo Oratori ob expositas rationes et allatas causas huiusmodi licentiam et agendi rationem confirmare: et etiam ad similes casus, in aliis locis et Civitatibus suae Dioecesis, prout necessitas expostulet, extendere.

Haec dum ab hac S. C. cum debita reverentia expostulo, et quaero, Emtiis VV. cuncta fausta et prospera in Domino adprecor.

Malacae, die 25 Aprilis anni 1897.

IOANNES, EPISCOPUS MALACITANUS.

RESPONSIO S. CONGREGATIONIS.

Rme Dne. Relatis in S. C. Concilii postulatis a te propositis in litteris die 25 Aprilis p. p. circa facultatem binandi,

Emi Patres rescribendum censuerunt: *Ad 1.um 2 um et 3.um: Non licere*; *et Ordinarius, quatenus in aliquo ex enunciatis casibus necessarium iudicet ut Sacrum iteretur, recurrat ad Apostolicam Sedem.* Idque notificari mandarunt, prout per praesentes exequor. Amplitudinis Tuae, cui me profiteor:

Uti fratrem,

A. *Card.* DI PIETRO, *Praefectus.*

B. *Archiep.* NAZIANZEN., *Pro-Secretarius.*

Romae, 10 Maii 1897.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE INDICIS.

CIRCA INTERPRETATIONEM VERBORUM *absque competentis auctoritatis licentia*, ART. 17 CONST. *Officiorum.*

A Sacra Congregatione Indulgentiarum, sub die 13 Iulii 1897 huic S. Indicis Congregationi propositum fuit sequens Dubium:

Utrum in Decreto N. 17 Decretorum Generalium *De prohibitione et censura librorum*, nuper a SSmo D. N. Leone PP. XIII. editorum, verba haec *non publicentur absque competentis auctoritatis licentia*, ita sint intelligenda, ut in posterum Indulgentiarum libri, libelli, foliae etc. omnes ad solos locorum Ordinarios pro impetranda licentia sint referendi? An vero subiiciendi sint censurae aut Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiarum, aut Ordinarii loci secundum normas ante novam Constitutionem *Officiorum ac munerum* stabilitas?

Sacra Indicis Congregatio, omnibus mature perpensis respondit:

Ad 1am partem *Negative.*

Ad 2am partem *Affirmative.*

Datum Romae ex Secretaria, S. Indicis Cong. die 7a Augusti 1897.

A. *Card.* STEINHUBER, *Praef.*

Fr. M. CICOGNANI O. P. *Secret.*

CONFERENCES.

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

THE ALTAR-WINE QUESTION.

We have at different times, and exhaustively, treated the question of altar wines, their requisite purity, the various dangers and tests of adulteration, and the relative value of different kinds of wine for practical use in the Holy Sacrifice. To the question repeatedly asked us whether certain California or Jersey or imported wines are suitable for sacramental use no satisfactory answer can possibly be given. In the United States, where the Government controls the product of viticulture only as to its alcoholic purity (apart from noxious ingredients), no absolute guarantee can be had that a wine is pure juice of the grape, *except the known integrity of the producer.* We say *absolute* guarantee, because there are cases where an artificial product cannot be distinguished from the natural growth with any certainty, not even by chemical analysis, since certain elements added, as sugar and the like, turn into alcohol during the process of fermentation.

Hence it is not altogether safe to trust to a given brand of wine as if it could not be adulterated. There are manufactured wines of all kinds. As a rule the dry (acid) wines are less likely to be doctored than the fruity (sweet) wines. But the only sure way of obtaining pure altar wine is to get it from a conscientious producer who realizes the value and the necessity of having pure wine for the altar.

A practical Catholic viticulturist will have no reason to deceive a priest if the latter consents to pay a reasonable

price for pure wine. He should, however, be made to understand that by pure wine we mean a wine made *only* of the ripe *juice of the grape*, for there are wines made of grapes and other fruits combined, which, though pure (that is, not adulterated by chemicals), are not so in our sense.

There are Bishops who, having had this matter much at heart, have placed the care of producing wine for the altar in the hands of trusted priests. Such wines may not always have the finer qualities of select table wines, but they are surely to be preferred for sacramental use.

In other cases Catholic wine merchants make a special study and care to select such products as would serve the altar without risk of desecration. But, however we turn it, the only guarantee is the personal integrity of the producer, who should have the testimony of the Bishop who knows him not only in his capacity as an honorable business man, but as producing *pure wine of the ripe grape*, which should be testified by solemn affidavit of the wine producer. The affidavits of agents or commission merchants who sell wine at second or third hand are surely not of the same value.

ECCLESIASTICAL MUSIC.

In reference to Father Henry's suggestions regarding the study of ecclesiastical music in our seminaries, allow me to state what is being done here in Milwaukee. *All* students of the Salesianum College and Seminary partake in the theoretical and practical instructions in sacred music. There is no exception, save in case of sickness. Furthermore, all students of college and seminary join in the singing of the Ordinary of the Mass, Kyrie, Gloria, etc.—Responses, Psalms and Hymns at Vespers; the Proper of the Mass, however, and all figured music are performed by a choir of forty students in the departments of philosophy and theology.

CHAS. BECKER, *Regens Chori*,
St. Francis, Wis.

CONFESSORS OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES.

Qu. Four years ago I was appointed regular confessor to a small community of School Sisters in a neighboring parish. It never occurred to me that my term expired at the end of three years and that the absolution given after that, though valid, would be unlawful. I read the answer to the Archbishop of Oregon given in the REVIEW, on the very day when I was expected to hear the Sisters' confessions; so before going into the Church where they were waiting, I consulted the pastor, who assured me that he had seen in Smith's *Elements* that the terms had been extended to six years for the United States. Taking the benefit of the doubt I heard the confessions as usual. I expect to see the Bishop about the matter, but in the meantime would ask you to say something about the extension of the term to six years, as there are, no doubt, other priests in the same predicament as myself.

Resp. In the given case the confessor has unlimited faculties, if he continues, as appears to be his practice, to receive the confessions of the religious in the parish church. The law demanding a change of confessors every three years applies only to community houses of religious women where the confessor goes and hears them—"extendi debet ad Societates Foeminarum conviventium more Communitatis, et habentium confessarios ordinarios qui inibi accedant; *secus vero* si ipsae piae foeminae adire solent in aliqua ecclesia publica."

It is not improbable that some of our Bishops have obtained an extension of the triennial limit in dioceses where there exists a want of apt confessors. As Dr. Smith gives no authority or reference for his statement we hesitate to accept it as of universal application even for the United States.

DR. DE BECKER'S INTERPRETATION OF PRESUMPTIVE ADOPTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

To the Editor, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

Prof. Jules De Becker's exhaustive dissertation on the fundamental Law of Adoption of Secular Priests in the

United States is learned and timely. But his solution of Father John's case appears to me erroneous. He gives it in the following words: "If examination can show that only a very short space of time elapsed between the expiration of the third year and the Bishop's notifying Father John that he did not intend to adopt him, that notice, we hold, would be in time and effective."

The decision, I take it, must be based exclusively on the decrees enacted by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, which are confessedly canonical. Now the Council decrees two forms of adoption, one which is called *formalis*, the other *praesumptiva*. The very fact that the latter is *praesumptiva*, *i. e.*, lacking the formality of the *formalis*, implies that the *praesumptiva* must be considered and interpreted in connection with the *formalis*. The Doctor will grant, no doubt, that the only essential difference between *formalem adoptionem* and *adoptionem praesumptivam* is that the latter lacks the *written incardinating* decree of the Bishop. Happily this is plain from the definitions which the Council itself gives of both. "Formalem declaramus eam esse quae per actum Episcopi documento signatum efficitur, qui sacerdotem alienae Dioecesis—in Clerum suum adscribit." (Third Plen. Counc. of Balt., Pag. 32.) "Praesumptivam *incardinationem* haberi declaramus si Episcopus elapso triennio vel respectivo quinquennio probationis actum adscriptionis formalem omiserit." (Ibid., pag. 32.)

Is it not a fact that, had the Council called the two forms of adoption *formalem* and *informalem* the same definitions could have been given of them? And if so, is it not a fact also that, if there be any ambiguity in the wording of the *informalis*, its correct interpretation must be sought for in the meaning of the *formalis*, if that be quite patent? Now let us see what the Council says speaking of the *formalis*. "Exigere tamen poterit experimentum ultra triennium, quo in casu Episcopus hoc suum ulterioris probationis propositum Sacerdoti scriptis significare debet, *antequam triennium expiret.*" (Ibid., pag. 32). It does not say *postquam* but "*antequam* triennium expiret." I will venture a step

further and say that the main reason why the Council gave quite a lengthy description of the manner in which the *adoptio formalis* should be effected, was to make quite plain the meaning of *adoptio praesumptiva*. In fact, what necessity was there of stating that "Episcopus hoc suum propositum ulterioris probationis sacerdoti in scriptis significare debet, *antequam triennium expiret*," if it did not mean to decree that, unless the Bishop did notify the priest "antequam triennium expiret," the *adoptio praesumptiva* would go into effect? Putting it concisely, the wording of decree No. 66 is of itself somewhat obscure, but the meaning is made quite clear by decree No. 63, which precedes it and of which it is, in one sense, but a negative; that is, *adoptio praesumptiva* is a *negative* of the *formalis*, and if we understand the latter we shall understand the former also.

The latinity of decree No. 66 is bad, and it requires no Cardinal Mai to read the English beneath the Latin. What the Fathers of the Council meant is, indeed, quite plain; but the scribe wrote *elapso* twice in the first four lines of the decree, where he should have written *labente* or *currente*. That is all.

I think also that Father John acted very wisely to continue to work two years longer in the Bishop of Y—'s Diocese. Why should he have made trouble for himself by presenting "a juridical claim to be regarded as a member of the diocesan clergy," before the Bishop ordered him out of the diocese? True, he might have retired to his former diocese and there instituted proceedings; but *melior est conditio possidentis*, and it is always preferable for a priest to be the defendant rather than the plaintive against a bishop.

And what if his former Bishop should have refused him faculties on the plea that he had become a subject of the Bishop of Y—?

L. A. DUTTO.

THE PORTIUNCULA INDULGENCE WITHOUT THE BISHOP'S APPROBATION.

Qu. Through a special favor our Congregation obtained from Rome the privilege of the Portiuncula, which we have now enjoyed for several years. Not long ago a missionary reading the *Breve* conferring the favor remarked that it lacked the signature of the Bishop of our Diocese, and that this might render the Indulgence invalid. We had never before thought of this matter, and if the necessity of obtaining the approbation of the Ordinary had been suggested to us when we obtained the privilege, we should, of course, have asked for it at once. Please state whether this involuntary omission renders the indulgence void?

Resp. The validity of the indulgence of the Portiuncula is in no wise affected by the omission to obtain the approval (written or otherwise) of the Ordinary. There exists, indeed, a general prescription of the Council of Trent according to which it belongs to the Ordinary to inspect, approve and promulgate such privileges when accorded to the faithful in his diocese. The object of this law is to prevent the spread of spurious and unauthorized concessions. But unless approbation is expressly required by the terms of the *Breve* it does not render the indulgence invalid. An exception is made in cases of canonical establishment of confraternities, the erection of the Via Crucis and certain personal faculties granted to priests. This is expressly stated in P. Beringer's work on Indulgences, published with the approbation of the S. Congregation of Indulgences. (I. Th. xiv., 2. Edit. xi.)

As a rule and for the sake of avoiding misunderstandings the Ordinary would, of course, expect to be informed of any extraordinary privilege obtained from the Holy See for any church or community in his diocese.

WAS THIS A VALID BAPTISM?

Qu. The lucid and interesting paper by H. J. H. in the December number of the REVIEW which showed that it is rather an excess of orthodoxy to banish peremptorily from the beatific vision every child that dies without the Baptism of water, recalls an incident

which I recently heard from a fellow-priest, and which may give additional food for thought in connection with the discussion which the editor promises to take up once more in the next number. I relate the fact substantially as I remember having heard it, though the priest to whom it happened would probably be more accurate as to details if he could be induced to describe the incident himself.

One day Father X. was called to administer the Sacraments to a lady of his parish who was sick after child-birth. Arriving at the house he found the child dead, and the mother, though very weak, improving. As the priest expressed his sympathy at the death of the infant, intending thereby to console the mother, she said in a somewhat anxious manner: "Father, we baptized it and I trust it is in heaven." After a little while she continued: "I saw the poor child gasping, and fearing for its eternal life, I asked the doctor present in the room whether it could live. He looked at me as if he would shake his head, though he did not say: no. I knew then that my child must be baptized at once. I begged the doctor, who is not a Catholic, to reach me the water. Seeing that I could not hold the pitcher, because I had the child aside of me and was too weak to lift my arm, I said, 'Doctor, pour the water over the child's head.' He knew what I wanted and whilst he wetted the tiny head I said, 'My dear little Joseph, I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.' Father, my child is baptized, is it not? And I will meet it in heaven if I should die now?—Oh, thank God!"

The priest had nodded assuringly as the woman finished her story. He knew his theology and that the act of baptizing to have validity must (in form and matter applied) proceed from the same person, so that if one party were to pronounce the words and another to pour the water, the baptism would be invalid. Yet here he could not persuade himself that God would frustrate the intention of the good woman who could not have done otherwise what she did to fulfil God's command. Was this baptism really invalid? Some of the priests here say it was, and that Father X. was guilty of minimizing the requirements of the sacramental act by allowing the people to think that the child could enter heaven.

Resp. The absence of the prescribed matter or form, or of the proper intention to perform the act of the Church, would unquestionably frustrate the validity of the Sacrament. Whether the baptismal grace may be supplied in some other

way is a matter of discussion. To say that it is never or cannot be supplied seems a needless rigorism.

But the question in the present case may take another form and incline us to admit that the child was validly baptized. The fact that the doctor poured the water did not necessarily make him a party to the baptism. If the mother had placed her child under a hydrant opened by another, or immersed it in a basin held by another, we would have no doubt about the validity of the sacramental act, because the mechanical application of the water proceeded at the instance of the mother, who by pronouncing the form, actually baptized, though she did not herself pour the water. In the same way the action of the physician was a mechanical act, not directed by his own but by the mother's intention. It was the action of a man but not properly what ethicians call a determined "human act." The law of the Church requires one moral agent for the administration of Baptism, and theologians tell us that two persons performing the act in part would destroy its moral unity. This is perfectly correct where there is an intention so to divide the act, which was surely not the case in the above instance. But even if there is room here for controverting the extent of applying the principle of moral unity in actions of this kind, there is no warrant for the absolute contrary statement, namely that the baptism was surely invalid and excludes the child from heaven. St. Bonaventure, whose view is cited by Pallavicino in the Reply of H .J. H. (p. 269), would be of this opinion also.

THE INVOCATION "ST. JOSEPH, FRIEND OF THE SACRED HEART."

Qu. I have seen somewhere a decree of the S. Congregation prohibiting the use of prayers in honor of St. Joseph under the title "Friend of the Sacred Heart," and substituting another prayer to St. Joseph, "Model and Patron of the Lovers of the Sacred Heart of Jesus." I have looked for the decree but cannot find it. Can you tell me where it can be found?

Resp. The S. Congregation of the Inquisition simply refused to endorse the above mentioned title in any way, as

the following decree shows. The invocation "St. Joseph, Model and Patron of the Lovers of the Sacred Heart of Jesus," certainly seems unobjectionable.

DE CULTU S. JOSEPH SUB TITULO: "AMICUS SS. CORDIS."

Feria iv. die 4 maii 1892.

Specialis examinis objectum cultus S. Joseph sub titulo: Amicus S. Cordis, Amico del S. Cuore—factus est: Eminentissimi ac Reverendissimi Cardinales in rebus fidei ac morum generales Inquisitores, omnibus mature perpensis, circumstantiis maxime in casu occurrentibus, decreverunt cum approbatione Sanctissimi D. N. Leonis PP. XIII., *circa rem propositam interloquendum non esse.*

Insuper praelaudati Eminentissimi Patres S. R. Congregationem monendam mandarunt, ne in posterum decreta, rescripta, etc., emanent, in quibus quomodocumque novus titulus, de quo supra, approbetur, aut etiam in quibus de eo simpliciter mentio fiat. (E S. Rom. Supr. Univ. Inquisit.)

THE NAME OF THE FOUNDER OF A RELIGIOUS ORDER IN THE PRAYER "A CUNCTIS."

To the Editor, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

I have just read the remarks in the last number of the REVIEW (pp. 208–209) concerning the prayer *A Cunctis*, and take the liberty of offering the following opinion on the subject of inserting the name of their Founder by Regulars.

The decree to which your correspondent, J. F., refers, is to be found in Gardellini, n. 5183, April 16, 1853, *in una Ord. Min. Observant.*, ad 19, "In ecclesiis, in quibus S. Titularis in orat. '*A cunctis*' jam nominatus est vel nominari non debet . . . potestne ad litteram N. nominari S. Pater Franciscus, de quo fit commemoratio in Suffragiis Sanctorum, ut nobis concedunt peculiares nostrae Rubricae?" *Resp. S. C. R.* "Negative, et detur Decretum in una Marsorum, 12 Nov., 1831, ad 31." Accordingly it appears that

Regulars are not allowed to insert the name of their Founder in the prayer *A Cunctis*, even if they have the privilege of adding his commemoration to the usual *Suffragia Sanctorum* in Lauds and Vespers.

The decree of June 17, 1843 (Gardellini, n. 4964), does indeed seem to allow Regulars to insert the name of their Founder "dummodo non omittatur Titularis," and is commonly quoted in this sense. It would thus seem as though we had here two contradictory decrees, both contained in the authentic collection. The ordinary rule in such cases is to follow the more recent decree—in this case therefore that of 1853, *forbidding* the insertion.

According to F. Schober the contradiction in our case is only apparent, not real. The decree of April 16, 1853, states the *general law* in the case, the decree of June 17, 1843, grants a *special privilege* to the Trinitarians. Cf. Schober, *Cerem. Missae*, Editio altera, 1888, pp. 56–57, foot note.

My conclusion is that Regulars are *not* allowed to insert the name of their Founder in the prayer *A Cunctis*, unless they have a special privilege to that effect.

J. H., C. SS. R.

IS THE CELEBRANT TO CHANT OR TO RECITE THE EPISTLE IN A "MISSA CANTATA?"

Qu. When a simple *Missa Cantata* is sung, that is, without deacon or sub-deacon, should the celebrant, in the absence of a cleric, chant the Epistle, or merely recite it as in low Mass? G. H.

Resp. The rubric of the Missal reads: "Si quandoque Celebrans cantat Missam sine Diacono et Subdiacono, epistolam cantat loco consueto aliquis lector superpelliceo indutus." (*Rit. celebr.*, tit. vi., n. 8.) According to the *Ephemerides Liturgicae* (iii., pp. 682, 683) this rubric prohibits the singing of the Epistle by the celebrant. De Herdt, De Conny, and other eminent rubricists who hold the opposite opinion, are charged with teaching "quod lex prohibet; hi ergo relinquendi, et legi standum."

This interpretation seems to us needlessly forced. The rubrics prescribe, indeed, that in the absence of a deacon or sub-deacon a lector or acolyte might sing the Epistle, but it does not prohibit the celebrant from doing so. The S. Congregation, in answer to the question "whether it would suffice if, in the absence of a lector, the celebrant were to recite the Epistle, or should he sing it?" replied: *Satius erit*, quod celebrans ipse epistolam *legat sine cantu.* (S. R. C., die 23 Apr. 1875, n. 5604.) This means rather, as P. Schober in his *Ceremoniae Missae Solemnis*, pag. 10, nota 28, intimates, that the Epistle need not be chanted, but that it is quite sufficient merely to read the same. The *Magister Choralis* (Haberl-Donnelly edit. ii., pag. 112) is even more explicit: "If assistant ministers are wanting, the Celebrant sings both Epistle and Gospel, but is recommended to sing the Epistle in a lower tone to that of the prayers preceding." By a recent Decree *it is permitted* to read the Epistle in a "Missa Cantata."

THE CHANT OF THE "ITE MISSA EST" ON SOLEMN FEASTS.

Qu. Would you kindly explain which of the forms given in the Missal for chanting the *Ite Missa est* should be used on the feast of the Assumption. There are two modes assigned, which seem equally to apply to this feast, one *pro festis solemnibus*, the other *pro Missis B. Mariae.*

Resp. Although the feast of the Assumption belongs to the class of days called *solemnia*, it takes the mode of chanting the "Ite Missa est" which is assigned for the *Missae B. Mariae, in Oct. Corp. Christi et Nativitate Domini.* Cf. *Magister Choralis* (Haberl-Donnelly, ed. ii.), pag. 136.

RENEWING THE PASCHAL CANDLE.

(*A Suggestion.*)

The candle-makers can easily put an end to the shift of blessing the same Paschal Candle for three years or so in succession by making the wick about three times as thick as it

is now made. And if they do so the Paschal Candle will give a great, large, brilliant and most beautiful flame, and the candle will be a far more striking symbol than it is at present of the Risen Christ, the Light of the world.

The Paschal Candle is lighted on the five Sundays of the Paschal time and from the beginning of Mass until the end of the Gospel on Ascension Day. It is lighted for about two hours during Mass and for about an hour during Vespers on each Sunday, and allowing an hour for Ascension Day, it burns about sixteen hours during the whole of the Paschal time. Let the candle manufacturers put sixteen-hour wicks in their candles and then we will have a new candle each year. In the meantime the assistant rectors, who usually have charge of the rubrics, can do something to promote their better observance by marking the candle, or what remains of it, into five equal parts above the grains of incense, and by lighting it good and early, and by not allowing it to be put out any Sunday until one of these parts has been consumed. The grains of incense will then be reached and consumed on Ascension Thursday, and a new candle will have to be bought next year. If the pastor will explain to the people the meaning of the Paschal Candle, he will find at least one in his parish who will be most anxious to have the honor of donating it each year.

J. F. S.

A NEW HISTORICAL TESTIMONY TO THE CRUCIFIXION OF OUR SAVIOUR.

(We publish the following communication from Professor Prinzivalli in Rome concerning the latest discovery of a mural engraving with inscription, which promises to be one of the most important documents aiding the purely historical inquiry regarding the Crucifixion of our Saviour. At the present writing Professor Marucchi, the leading archeologist in Rome, is still engaged in deciphering the details of the inscription. The age and rude manner of the incised letters leave some doubt as to the reading of the word *Chrestus* which might be *Crescens* and the word *Pilatus* which may read *Piletus*. Still, even with these possible differences the discovery

loses little of its importance. Professor Prinzivalli will follow up the matter and keep the readers of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW informed concerning the progress of the deciphering of this and other newly discovered monuments likely to prove of interest to students of Christian archeology. Several *graffiti* previously found have been recently described in the papers and periodicals, but none of them possesses the importance of the present specimen.)

THE EDITOR.

On January 27th, of this year, Prof. Horatio Marucchi who is charged with the restoration of the inscriptions found in the subterranean vaults of the old palace of Tiberius on the Palatine Hill, discovered on the plaster of a cellar-wall a *graffito* or mural engraving together with an inscription and a list of names.

This cellar had up to that date been completely concealed, because Caligula had rebuilt upon the site his palace adjacent to the "Clivus Victoriae."

The *graffito* appears to have been the handiwork of a soldier of Tiberius—for it is proved, that the vault served as a barrack for the soldiers who guarded the palace of this emperor. It represents the scene of the Crucifixion, Calvary and the Redeemer (*nudus*, as the inscription explains), and raised by means of cords upon a beam (*palus*). *Palus* was the term used at the time to designate the cross, its shape being that of the Greek *T*. The inscription, subsequently fastened above it, gave to the sacred wood the true form of a cross. Indeed, on examining this rough *graffito*, we discern in the lower portion the figures of soldiers preparing a rather large inscription, which fact confirms the narrative of the Gospels saying that the title was in three languages—Hebrew, Greek and Latin.

At the Redeemer's side, on a beam (*palus*), is fastened one of the two thieves. In another part the nails, with which Jesus is to be pierced, are seen ready at hand. The name of each person represented in the *graffito* is given, and over the one who is to be nailed to the cross is written the word CHRESTUS. We know that it was by this name—

Chrestus—that the Saviour was known. Suetonius (Claudio §III.), in censuring the Christians of Rome for their incessant quarrels with the Jews, uses the expression "Chresto impulsore." Tacitus mentioning the same fact likewise uses the name Chrestus.

Our inscription was in all probability written by a pagan soldier, who had served in Jerusalem and who may have been present at the Crucifixion. So far it has not been possible to decipher the entire inscription, for the letters are rudely cut, as though with the point of a short sword. In the list of names we have that of Pilate and other known Romans. Furthermore, the inscription states that Jesus was scourged secretly (*in secretis*), and that, although condemned to be crucified, He was a man who greatly benefitted His people.

As the task of deciphering the other parts of the inscription is still incomplete, we have not been enabled to fix the precise date of the *graffito*. If the inscription should contain a date it would probably put an end to the long controversy as to the exact date of Christ's birth.

Meanwhile there appears to be no doubt as to the extraordinary importance of this discovery. By consent of all archeologists of early and later times, from Bosio to De Rossi, it is established as final, that only in the third century did Christian painters and sculptors begin to suggest in their works the figure of the Redeemer, and the scene of the Crucifixion on Golgotha—to suggest, I say, for it was merely by symbolical types taken from the Bible, that the great Sacrifice was hinted at.

Perhaps the traditional representation of Jesus had been preserved in some pictures dating from shortly after His Death. Indeed St. Augustine tells us that in the days of Hadrian, not far remote from Apostolic times, the sect of Carpocratians possessed certain pictures reputed to be portraits of Christ, of the same sort no doubt as that in the possession of Alexander Severus in the imperial palace. But these few isolated specimens excepted, we have nothing which portrays the actions much less the Death of our

Saviour. Armellini (*Archeologia Christiana*, Rome, 1883) says: "It was not until the close of the fourth century and about the beginning of the fifth, that (Christian) art gradually threw off this reserve, and represented on the great walls of the basilicas, scenes taken from the great drama of the persecutions beginning with that of the Passion."

Already since 1857 we possessed the remarkable *graffito*, found likewise on the Palatine, and to be seen at present in the Museo Kircheriano: *ΑΛΕΞΑΜΕΝΟΣ ΣΕΒΕΤΕ ΘΕΟΝ*—Alexamenos—(Alexander) adore thy God.[1] This God whom the pagans affected to deride by their representations was a man with an ass' head hanging on a cross.

If the present *graffito* does not disappoint all expectations it will prove immeasurably superior in importance to any other as an impartial testimony to the historical fact of the great drama of the Passion.

Naturally, at a time so close to the discovery and under the first impression of this great event in Christian archeology, it is impossible to write at greater length. We are anxiously awaiting the full interpretation of the inscription, and while we congratulate the able Roman archeologist on this happy discovery, we shall not fail to watch and report the result to the readers of the AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VIRGINIO PRINZIVALLI.

Rome, January 30, 1898.

ECHOES OF THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

In communicating to the faithful the Holy Father's Encyclical on the subject of the Catholic elementary schools, the Bishops of the several Sees in Canada took occasion to set forth their position towards this question and the principle involved in it for all Catholics. There is a lesson and example for us of the United States in the faithful yet unequal struggle of our co-religionists in England and the Dominion

1 Cf. F. Becker, *Das Spottcrucifix der Rom. Kaiserpaläste. 1866.*—Garrucci, *Civiltà Cattolica.* 1857.

against State usurpation of the right and duty of parents and the Church to control education. It will make a fitting supplement to the Encyclical of His Holiness, of which we published the Latin and English text in the last issue of the REVIEW, to print here one or two extracts from the Pastoral Letters of the Canadian Bishops.

In the Letter addressed to the faithful of the Primatial See of Canada occurs the following concise statement of the difficulties which occasioned the Papal Encyclical:

Ever since their entry into the Canadian Confederation, the Catholics of Manitoba had their own schools, wherein their children were taught conformably to their religious principles and the direction of the Church. They possessed these schools, not in virtue of any concession or tolerance whatsoever, but in virtue of a solemn pact which honor and justice forbade to break and in which they placed absolute trust. Respectful themselves of the persuasions and the liberties of those who did not share their belief, they demanded, not a favor, but simply the exercise of the right they possessed of bringing up their children according to the dictates of their conscience. During twenty years, these rights were recognized, and peace and harmony reigned throughout the province of Manitoba. All at once, for reasons that we need not here seek to penetrate, in 1890, an unfortunate law came to cast consternation in the midst of our brethren, and to deprive them, who were the weaker, the less numerous, the poorer inhabitants of that country, of that liberty which was assured to them by the most sacred engagements, and which was dearer to them than their very life.

THEIR SCHOOLS DISAPPEARED

to be replaced by public schools, to the erection and maintenance of which they were forced to contribute with their money, and which, nevertheless, their conscience as Catholics, owing to the regulations there to be observed, the books adopted, the religious neutrality there introduced, made it their duty to forbid to their children. They felt themselves hurt; they realized all the more the injustice of which they were the victims, since, in another province, where the Protestants form a small minority, the brothers of those who stripped them of their rights were being treated by Catholics with an equality and a cordiality publicly recognized on all sides. Then began for them an era of grief and of sacrifices.

They protested nobly and energetically, and it may be said that throughout the whole country all who possess the sense of justice, and for whom the stipulations of a contract are not an empty form, whether or not they belonged to the same faith, protested with them. After these claims, which unfortunately remained ineffectual, the legal contest began. The question was one that interested in the highest degree the Catholic conscience; the Bishops could not, therefore, remain neutral and inactive. They were true to their duty: united together they appealed to the Catholics and to all sincere and loyal citizens. It seemed to them that so just and holy a cause should soon triumph. Their teachings and their counsels are still fresh in our memory; posterity, we are sure, will be grateful to them for what they did during those sorrowful years in behalf of an oppressed minority. Alas! a question which might have so easily and speedily been solved according to the sole principles of natural equity, meets with numerous and unexpected complications. Borne from one tribunal to another, it was thrown into the arena of politics. There again, as it was their right and duty, the Bishops, placing themselves above all party-interest and all political speculations, endeavored to make the cause triumph, because then, as before, it ever remained a question of conscience, and they could not forsake it. The federal law proposed to solve the question was foiled, and, since that moment, our country has continued to be the scene of a painful strife. A new government took the place of the old one, and we learned one day that between it and the government of Manitoba an agreement had taken place, a compromise had been concluded. That compromise was

NOT THE RESTITUTION OF THE RIGHTS

violated; it was not even an improvement that might be conciliated with the prescriptions of the Church so formal in this matter. How could the Episcopate have approved it? The Bishops therefore declared it unacceptable, and the Catholics of Manitoba continued to support their own schools at the cost of the greatest sacrifices.

The situation became more and more strained. The question was presented to the Pope, to that venerated head of the Church whom Catholics acknowledge as their supreme pastor, to that great diplomatist, to that master, both prudent and wise, whom even they who are not his sons have chosen for the arbiter of their difficulties.

As he had already done, in similar circumstances, for other nations, Leo XIII. was pleased to act as our teacher and our

guide. But before expressing his judgment in so grave a matter, and in order to give satisfaction to all, the Sovereign Pontiff appointed a Delegate Apostolic, and charged him to present a report after having heard the parties interested.

Leo XIII. speaks therefore to us to-day, our dearly beloved brethren, with a heart full of the liveliest affection, but not without having examined and maturely weighed all, confident that his word will be greeted as a word of equity and peace.

From the Letter of the Archbishop of Toronto and the Suffragan Bishops of the Province, we take the following admirable summary of the Church's teaching against such as would "banish God and His Christ from the school-house and oust the Church from her divine rights over the education of her children:"

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH HAS THE RIGHT

to provide for, to direct and control, the education of its children; and this right is derived from the divine commission committed to her in the words of Christ: "Go ye therefore, teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. xxviii., 19, 20). Now this commission inculcates the duty of teaching all the doctrines of faith and all the principles of morality. Whatever regards the nature and attributes and moral government of God, as well as whatever concerns the conscience of man in his individual capacity, as well as in his numerous social relations, all this is contained in the divine commission. Now these subjects necessarily imply a direct or indirect connection with the various departments of human knowledge, and therefore the exercise of the divine commission must embrace the direction and control of every system of education designed for the children of the Church, lest in any particular department of human knowledge they should be infected with errors or opinions at variance with their faith. So that the divine commission given to the Church implies a positive duty to teach all divine truth; and the correlative duty or right to prevent the teaching and oppose the propagation of every error opposed to God's revelation. This right of inspection and control of Catholic education belongs preëminently to the Episcopal body, under the guidance of the Holy See, according to the words of the Apostle: "Take heed to yourselves and the whole flock wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you Bishops to rule the

Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood" (Acts xx., 28). The Church, then, cannot abdicate her rights or abandon her duties in connection with the question of education, nor can she approve of any educational system that shuts her out from the school-house and excludes her influence, her protection and guidance. She may, in certain circumstances, be compelled to tolerate systems not in harmony with her ideals, but this she does to avoid worse evils and under the stress of necessity. This is, in brief, the Catholic position on this important question of education.

ACCENT IN CHANT.

The Editor AMERICAN ECCL. REVIEW:

Qu. I send you to-day a little book which fell into my hands a short while ago, entitled "The Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary According to the Roman Breviary." Under the heading "Rubrics and Explanations," the compiler says: "We have marked the accent on a few foreign words which take the accent on the second syllable, v. g., Jesùs, Jacòb, Davìd, Siòn, Israèl, Amèn, and on a few monosyllables as tù autem." Again he tells us that "Prepositions when they precede the noun which they govern, take no accent, v. g., praeter Dominum, but they take the accent when they follow the governed word." And also "Conjunctions when leading a clause or phrase are not accented, v. g., quoniam bónus. If they follow a word of their own clause or phrase, or introduce an ellipsis, they receive the accent, v. g., tu áutem, nos véro, ét tu in principio."

Permit me to ask you if these rules are correct. I am strongly of the opinion that they are not, that they are contrary to the laws of Latin pronunciation, and certain am I that they are at variance with the accentuation of the Roman Breviary. For many years I have been pronouncing the words Jesus, Jacob, Sion, etc., with the accent on the first syllable, and the word "amen" with both syllables equally long, and I can find nothing in the "Mechlin," "Tours" or "Ratisbon" editions of the Roman Breviary that would lead me to believe that they should be pronounced as the compiler of this new edition of the "Little Office" asserts.

Again I am at a loss to know why a "few monosyllables" should be marked with the accent at all, as also why the same preposition or conjunction should in one case receive the accent and not in another. What is the "ratio" of these rules?

A hasty examination of this book will show that the compiler has not always followed his own rules. He has, at least in one case, marked the word "bónus" which is against the rule of dissyllables, and has failed to mark tu and autem in other cases. He has also given the accent to words like áperi and ídeo when they begin with capital letters—a thing not done in the Roman Breviary or Missal.

Will you have the goodness to give your views on these rules? You will oblige not only myself, but a number of other priests who are as much puzzled over them as I am myself.

J. F. N.

Resp. The editor of the work referred to by our correspondent apparently desired the readers of his summary Preface to consult Dom Pothier's *Les Mêlodies Grêgoriennes* for a fuller presentation of the question of the proper accentuation of Latin words. But this work is not, as is pointed out in the "Review" we give the book in the present number, easily accessible to most of those who are to use *The Little Office.* As an answer to our correspondent's questions we therefore translate from Dom Pothier's classic work, in answer.

I. Conjunctions, when they begin a phrase or a member of a phrase, have no accent: thus in *sicut erat, atque dixit, et vos, quoniam bonus, ut det illis* . . . the conjunctions *sicut, atque, ut, et, quoniam* should not, regularly, be accented. If in the breviaries these kinds of words are, despite the rule, marked with an accent (like *quóniam*), no attention should be paid to it except when certain modulations—for example, the mediation in psalmody—demand or require an accent.

Conjunctions, although they begin a phrase or member of a phrase, should, however, receive an accent if, being separated from what follows, they have a meaning proper to themselves because of ellipsis. Thus *et* and *sed* should evidently be accented in the following examples: *Et: Tu in principio, Domine, terram fundasti.—Non dixit Jesus: Non moritur. Sed: Sic eum volo manere donec veniam.*

Conjunctions which do not begin a phrase or member of a phrase take an accent: *tu aútem, fecit vêro, dixit ênim.*

II. Prepositions and adverb-prepositions, if they immediately precede their object, have no accent. Thus, in *super eum . . . praeter Dominum, infra tectum . . . a solis ortu, in memoria aeterna . . .* the first word of each of these examples is united with the following (*i. e., forming a single idea*) and should not, therefore, receive the stress of the voice which constitutes accent.

When prepositions are placed after their object they receive an accent: *te própter, te síne, tectum ínfra, montem súpra, fronde súper viridi.*

In defence of these rules Dom Pothier quotes Priscian: "Praepositiones . . . si casibus praeponuntur, gravantur (*i. e., receive the grave accent, which is not marked in books, as it is practically the absence of accent or stress of the voice*); cum vero praepostere ponuntur, acuto accentu efferuntur, v. g., *te própter.*"

He quotes also Quintilian, "who gives us the reason of this distinction when he says: Mihi id videtur generalem accentus regulam mutare quod in his locis verba in pronuntiatione conjungimus aut junctim efferimus. Nam cum dico: *circum littora*, duo tanquam unum enuntio, dissimulata distinctione. Quod idem accidit in illo: *Trojae qui primus ab oris.* Separata vero vel postposita eadem vocabula a praecepto communi non recedent. (Inst. or. L. I. c. 5.)

III. Relative pronouns, when expressing only a simple relation, have no accent: *Deus qui fecit de tenebris lumen splendescere. Pater noster qui es in coelis. Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi.*

But when no antecedent is expressed, they take an accent: *Quí vult venire post me. Quí facit haec. Quí tollis peccata mundi. Quí sedes ad dexteram Patris.*

So, too, interrogative pronouns have the accent: *Quí sunt isti?* . . .

With respect to the Hebrew words mentioned by our correspondent, we quote the following:

I. Hebrew words ending in *ias* are . . . accented on the penultimate: Isaías. Isaíae. . . .

María is accented on the penultimate, by custom and analogy, and not by any laws of the Hebrew language, which gives to this word another form. . . .

II. It is usage, also, which accents Hebrew words, with the exception of the preceding (and also Jeremías, Ananías, Allelúia) in a general way, on the last syllable, provided that these words are not declined after the fashion of Latin words. Thus are pronounced, with the accent at the end, not only Gábriel, Michaél, Israél, Abrahám, Jacób, Davíd, etc., but also Melchisedéch, Abimeléch, Nabuchodonosór, etc.; although the Hebrews pronounced Melchisédech, Albimélech, Nabuchodonósor, with the accent on the penultimate syllable. Thus, too, Sabaóth.

III. But Hebrew words, when declined, are treated as Latin words: Gábriel, Ábrahae, Raphaélem, Júdae.

IV. Thus, too, Hebrew words having a Latin form and always declined like Latin words: Ánna, Ánnae, Joánnes, Joánnem.

V. The word *Jesus* comes from the Hebrew through the Greek; it received in Greek, and retained in Latin, in all its cases, the accent on the last syllable: Jesús, Jesú, Jesúm.

Our correspondent asks if the rules given by the editor of *The Little Office* are correct. We have limited our answer to the authority of Dom Pothier, to whom the editor himself refers his readers. Fuller information on the subject can be sought in Donaldson's *Varronianus* and in his *Complete Latin Grammar* (and the long list of authorities to whom he acknowledged indebtedness); in Gildersleeve's *Latin Grammar* (with a long list of authorities supplementing the Preface); in Dom Pothier's *Les Mélodies Grégoriennes*, Chap. viii. But the information, while copious, is not so coherent as to form the basis of an authoritative answer to our correspondent's questions. The accentuation of the Pustet editions is—Dom Pothier and fautores to the contrary notwithstanding—probably as *correct* as any other, while it is certainly much more convenient and practicable than any other. *Adhuc sub judice lis est!*

H. T. Henry.

BOOK REVIEW.

THE LIFE OF SAINT AUGUSTINE, Bishop and Doctor. A historical study by Philip Burton, C. M. Third Edition, much enlarged. With Map.—Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1897. Pp. 474.

St. Augustine of Hippo has himself given us a picture true to life of his personality, that is, his heart and mind in their respective operations. The thirteen books of his *Confessions* lay bare the errors and the battles of the first thirty years from the time when he had attained the age of reason ; and the scenes and acts of that period are illumined by the soft and inspiring light of deeply religious reflections. As to the workings of his intellect we have on the one hand his numerous philosophical, dogmatic, moral, polemical and exegetical writings, apart from those marvellous treatises on the sciences of dialectics, rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic, music and pedagogics, some of which have remained to us, unhappily, only in fragments ; but we possess, what is quite as valuable in this connection, a critical directory of the Saint's writings, in which he analyzes the methods adopted by himself in their composition, the logical process which he pursued in the search after truth, and which led him to embrace the Christian religion as surpassing not only all the vaunted philosophical systems of pagan antiquity, but as satisfying the cravings of the heart, which has reasons of which the head may know nothing. This work is the one entitled *Retractationes* or *Retractationum libri duo.* Far from defending himself as blamelessly correct in the treatment of the great questions which his own inquisitive mind, thirsting for unequivocal truth, had forced upon him, he tests his own conclusions with relentless critical severity, and, by weighing in turn each probable objection, guards against the charge of real or seeming evasion and contradiction.

It is a noble picture which we thus gain of the great Saint, and yet it is only very partial. The last forty years of that wondrously active life are recorded in the ten folio volumes of St. Augustine's works, and they show him to us as the theologian, the defender of

the faith, the reformer of morals, the originator of canonical community life and of clerical seminaries; but they tell us comparatively little—unless by inference—of the domestic relations, the cordial bonds between bishop and priest, father and children; they give us no picture of the teeming Catholic life in the northwest of Africa, where to-day all seems barren, the soil and the people equally neglected, no memorial of its former wealth and Christian glory except in the names and titles of sees *in partibus infidelium*, their holders banished or hindered from the exercise of their pastoral functions.

At the time of the Vandal invasion, that is, about two years before the death of St. Augustine, the West African Church had more than six hundred bishoprics. This did not include the Catholic population east of Tripoli. The Vandals might have been tamed into submission to the yoke of Christian civilization but for the spites and hostilities of the Arians. What the Vandal and Arian failed to destroy, the Saracen did in the seventh century, so that soon there remained not one of the flourishing churches of the old consular possessions. The metropolitan see of Carthage, once the seat of St. Cyprian, with more than one hundred and fifty suffragans, has been revived in our own day (1884), but its ancient suffragans are to-day represented by a single title (i. p. i.), that of Talbora. The archiepiscopal see of Adrumetum, with an equal number of bishoprics formerly dependent upon it, has but five of them remaining in name, which are conferred as titular sees; and in like manner it has fared with Tripoli and Numidia, the two Mauretanias, and other metropolitan sees once of great importance.

Now all the glory and the reality of those days is recalled by Father Burton's Life of the Saint. He has lived in Algeria, and many times traversed the roads that lead to the ancient Hippo, because he wished there to study in its proper setting the magnificent picture of the great Bishop. The work is not altogether new, it has gone through three editions; but for many or most of our readers it will contain new lights, inspire fresh warmth kindled from the burning heart of the Saint. The chapters which will probably attract and instruct most are those which deal with his private life, his intercourse with his clergy, especially at the Cathedral; the manner in which he treats his disciples and friends, and—what is no less important—his adversaries. There is a chapter on "How to read St. Augustine," another on "St. Augustine and the Bible," which latter is newly added to this edition. Other additions have been made in the Appendix which serves as notes to the text; this Ap-

pendix it will be necessary to consult, since the edition is evidently printed from stereotyped plates.

From a critical point of view there is nothing to be said which is not commendatory. The author has used to excellent purpose the biography of the Saint by the holy Bishop of Calama, St. Possidius, who knew him intimately, and to which Salinas has affixed excellent notes ; also the Vita by Tillemont and the Benedictines. Morcelli's great work *Africa Christiana* and the *Acta Africana* have also been freely consulted, whilst in the delineation of the boundaries of provinces the author makes Victor Vitensis the determining authority.

THE ENGLISH BLACK MONKS OF ST. BENEDICT. A Sketch of their History from the Coming of St. Augustine to the Present Day. By the Rev. Ethelred L. Taunton. In two volumes. London: John C. Nimmo. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1897.

Much excellent work has been done of late years in the field of Church history. Catholic scholars have availed themselves of the stores of documentary evidence which are now at their disposal. The new methods of scientific research have been turned to good account, and fresh light has been thrown on regions too long darkened by ignorance, and prejudice, and party passion. The facts have at length been shown in their true nature, and many an honored name has been rescued from undeserved oblivion, or delivered from the clouds of calumny raised by the controversial writers of a ruder day.

The great monastic orders of the middle ages are among the chief sufferers from this theological prejudice, and the misrepresentations of popular Protestant tradition. Yet, assuredly, of all none have a better claim to a full measure of justice at the hands of impartial and enlightened historians. Happily, this claim has not been allowed to pass unheeded. And something has been done to show that the mediæval monks were very different from the dissolute and idle drones that figure in historical romances and popular works of history. In the eloquent pages of Montalembert, so ably interpreted to English readers by a graceful writer lately lost to our literature, the world has learned to know the Monks of the West as the foremost preachers of the Gospel, the pioneers of civilization, the guardians of literary culture, and the nursing fathers

of popular freedom. More recently Dom Gasquet has told us the true story of the Dissolution of the English Monasteries in the days of Tudor tyranny. His powerful exposure of the fraud and violence which wrought their ruin has gone far to vindicate the memory of the monks from the charges cast upon them by a covetous king and his craven Parliament.

Montalembert's third volume shows us the bright dawn of English monasticism, while Dom Gasquet draws a painful picture of its downfall, and at the same time reminds us that in himself and his brethren the sons of St. Benedict are still laboring in England to revive the glories of the past. But there was need of another history to bind these three periods together, filling up the gaps in the picture, and telling in one consecutive narrative the story of the monks and their work on English soil from the coming of Augustine till the present day. This is the task which Father Taunton has undertaken and successfully accomplished in the two massive volumes before us. The ground covered is, indeed, somewhat more restricted than that of Dom Gasquet's "Dissolution of the English Monasteries," which dealt with all the various religious bodies existing in England at the time of the Reformation, whereas the present work is entirely devoted to the history of one great order. It is only in this way that the story of English monachism can be told with anything like completeness. For each several order must needs be enough, and more than enough, to fill the hands of an industrious historian, and crowd the pages of more than one goodly volume.

In the case of some of the religious communities which have flourished on English soil, it may perhaps be possible to give within reasonable limits a fairly full account of all their various foundations, their origin and gradual growth, and the leading events that marked their history. But the historian of the English Black Monks of St. Benedict is confronted by such a multitudinous mass of materials that his task is one of peculiar difficulty. Here, at any rate, a full and detailed history of the order in all its many English foundations is out of the question. For this the student must fain betake himself to the original chronicles of the various abbeys, some of which have been published in recent years; or if the story need retelling in more modern fashion, it must be told in a series of separate histories or monographs dealing in turn with Canterbury, and St. Edmund's, and Westminster, and the other great mediæval houses. The history of the English Benedictine Congregation must

be cast on broader and simpler lines. And the artist who essays to paint this historic picture must resolutely refrain from such details as would but crowd his canvas and mar the unity and simplicity of the whole. At the same time he must be on his guard against the opposite danger of destroying its vigor and reality, and giving a mere abstract shadowy outline devoid of life, and warmth, and color. Happily, in the present case, Father Taunton has succeeded in keeping clear of the pitfalls which beset him on either side, and his history of the Black Monks is at once a luminous and succinct account of the rise, the gradual growth, the downfall and revival of the English Benedictine Congregation, and a picture instinct with life and reality.

Father Taunton is already known by his edition of Bacquez' invaluable manual on the Divine Office, as well as by sundry papers on ecclesiastical music and other liturgical topics. But even those who have appreciated his earlier writings may find signs of new and hitherto unsuspected powers in the book before us. If we are not mistaken, it will win a wide circle of readers and give its author a high place among contemporary Catholic historians, for it bears manifest tokens of the painstaking research and careful use of original documents which the present generation has learnt to expect from writers of history. Besides this indispensable condition, the author has qualities which make him specially fit for the work he he has undertaken. At first sight, it might seem more natural that this task should have fallen to the lot of some member of the Benedictine order, which assuredly has no lack of capable historians. But Father Taunton, though an outsider, has been educated by the Black Monks and has caught no small portion of the true Benedictine spirit. Thus he brings to his task that love of the great order, and that familiar acquaintance with its laws, and its ways and customs, which belong to those who bear the mantle of St. Benedict; while on the other hand he is perhaps enabled to speak with somewhat more freedom, and praise with a better grace, from the fact that he is himself an outsider. But it is time to quit these general considerations, and give our readers some account of the result of Father Taunton's labors.

The history of the English Black Monks is here set before us as one continuous whole, for the Benedictines amongst us to-day maintain an unbroken succession from the monks who entered England in the train of St. Augustine. At the same time the story very naturally falls into two main divisions, separated by the

stormy straits of the Tudor Reformation. For though, by the slender thread of a single life, the succession was handed on in spite of the havoc wrought by the dissolution of the monasteries, the work of ages had yet in some sense to begin afresh in strangely altered circumstances. This division corresponds pretty nearly with the two volumes of Father Taunton's history. In the first he tells the story of the mediæval monasteries, concluding with a brief account of their tragic downfall, and a painful picture of the divided state of English Catholics when the Black Monks once more came into the field, to bear their part in reclaiming from heresy the land which their fathers had purged of paganism.

Some exception has been taken to the relative proportions of these two main divisions of the work, and it must be allowed that the history of the past three hundred years fills a much larger space than that of the ten preceding centuries. Yet when we come to consider the character of these two periods, and the practical scope of his work, we cannot think that Father Taunton has erred in the brevity of his pre-Reformation sketch of Benedictine history, or in the length of space allotted to the later part of the story. Happy is the country that has no history, and on the same principle the unhappier ages are often those which offer the most abundant materials to the historian. Long years of peace and plenty may be recorded in a few words, but times of change and struggle have in them more that must needs be told at some length. At the same time, the story of the few monasteries founded since the Reformation admits of being told with something like completeness in reasonable limits, and is, moreover, specially interesting to readers of the present day. The mediæval abbeys, on the other hand, are too numerous to be treated in the same fashion and too remote to require it.

In this earlier portion of his work, the author has wisely confined his attention to the leading facts in the foundation and gradual growth of the English Benedictine Congregation. He brings out very clearly that characteristic feature of Benedictine monasticism, that each individual monastery is a veritable home, self-centered and independent. And he shows how, partly from the force of circumstances and the example of the other orders, especially that of the Cluniac monasteries, and partly in obedience to the mandate of the Fourth Lateran Council, the various abbeys without losing their independence were linked together in one, and the unity and discipline of the order consolidated by the formation of the General

Chapter, where representatives of the several English abbeys in each province met to legislate for the order as a whole, and deal with the correction of abuses and the due enforcement of discipline. Some abbeys, notably that of Canterbury, seem to have claimed exemption from the jurisdiction of the Chapter. American readers may perhaps see some analogy between the Congregation with its autonomous abbeys, and the Constitution of their own Republic with its self-governing but United States. And it is interesting to observe that, as Father Taunton tells us later on in the work, Benjamin Franklin spent some time with the Monks of St. Edmund's Monastery at Paris, and "it has been said, took from the constitutions of the English Benedictines many features for those of the United States."[1] What those features were we will not venture to inquire. But perhaps some American Benedictine equally familiar with the laws of his country and the rules of his order may be able to throw some light on the matter. A mere outsider may be content to observe the analogy indicated above and to recognize the large spirit of liberty, equality and brotherhood which animates both the ancient order and the modern Republic.

The chapters which deal with "The Coming of the Monks," and "The Norman Lanfranc," are full of valuable matter. But a subsequent chapter devoted to "The Monk in his Monastery," will awaken a deeper interest. Here Father Taunton has attempted a far more difficult task than the due recording of facts and sifting of evidence. He has sought to give his readers a faithful and lively picture of the life led in a mediæval monastery. It is not the first time that modern readers have been given a glimpse of that olden monastic life. A great writer of our age has taken one of the old chronicles of St. Edmund's Abbey as his text, and has made the Past live again in the Present. Those who have seen that picture can readily recall the stalwart figure of Monk Sampson striding across the fields, the anxious hour of his election as Abbot, his years of strenuous rule, his firmness and wisdom, his labors and cares and sorrows. It all rises before us from the buried past at the waving of the master's wand. Father Taunton's picture is naturally cast on a somewhat humble scale. But if in this case the artist's hand has less power and vigor, the materials at his disposal are more abundant, and he knows well how to use them. His own practical knowledge of monastic life enables him to give his picture

1 Vol. ii., p. 285.

greater accuracy in detail, and what is more he is able to understand the inner spirit of the life he is describing. Instinctively feeling that a mere enumeration of rules and practices and customs would be too dry and formal, Father Taunton has happily chosen to give his account of the monk's life the form of an imaginary biography, and tells the story not of some *individuum vagum*, but of "John Weston, Monk of Lynminster." "The facts," he warns us, "are true; but the reader must bear in mind that the setting is imaginary."

The result is a very pleasing picture, which forms one of the most successful portions of the work. Covering as it does the whole course of a mediæval monk's life, and bringing together in one the scattered notices of various chronicles and other documents, it is naturally too long to be quoted in its entirety. But the following passages will give our readers some notion of its main merits.

"John Weston was a monk of Lynminster, an abbey with a history counted by centuries. The son of a knight, at an early age his widowed mother had placed him in the claustral school at this, the most famous abbey in the neighborhood. Here his father and uncles had also received such education as had fallen to their lot. To the abbey he had been offered by his mother, according to the old ceremony. One day at Mass, after the gospel, the chalice was put into his hands and the priest wrapped up the child's hands in the altar-cloth[1] as a sign that he was, if found worthy, to be dedicated to the service of God. From his earliest days—he was but seven—he was kept under strict discipline;[2] and wore in the monastery a form of the monk's dress, and had his head shaven in the form of a crown. He was taught along with other boys, perhaps in the free school or in the singing-school, which most of the great abbeys supported for the services of their ministers. He had a sweet voice and some talent in singing; so it is likely he found a place in the singing-school. The treatment was kind but severe. If he became a monk, it were well he should know from his earliest days that a monk had to work and not live an idle life; and if he returned to the world, what better lesson could he take out than the great law of labor? John was taught among other things reading, writing, his Latin grammar, some simple elements of the art of reckoning, his prayers and faith, the laws of politeness, and the great art of holding his tongue. Singing would not be forgotten. Plain-song and prick-song had mysteries the knowledge of which was highly considered; and beside John, with all his companions,

1 Rule of St. Benedict, Ch. lix.

2 "The children are to be kept under discipline at all times and by every one."—Rule, Ch. lxiii.

had to attend in the great minster every day and sing at the solemn mass and vespers.

"While there was a good deal of solid instruction going on, and a good deal of knowledge was being instilled into him, the boy's mind was being educated and its powers developed. He was quietly and unconsciously drinking in the influence of the place. His character was forming itself to habits of industry, self-restraint, thrift, charity in dealings with others; and he was gaining a sense of the reality of life. All he saw in the lives of those with whom he passed his days, their earnestness and diligence, their prompt obedience to the abbot, and their frequent little practices of humility, and above all the solemn chanting of the office and the daily Sacrifice, acts not of this earth, all these must have had their effect on the boy. The more so as it was the outcome of what he saw and observed for himself, more than anything said or preached at him. For at Lynminster there was little of that sort of thing. Monks after St. Benedict's mind are not what the world think them to be. Religion being the very atmosphere in which they live, God's side of every question comes so natural to them, so much a matter of course, that there is no trying to be always 'improving the occasion' nor striking attitudes, mental or otherwise, which are foreign to their simple idea of what He requires. The monks preferred, if God was calling the boy, to let Him do His own work in His own way. They dared not force or hurry on what they knew was in wiser hands than theirs.

"John was a boy, merry of heart and full of life and fun, as all healthy English boys are; and though these qualities have to be regulated like everything else, yet, as they are most valuable, his teachers were careful not to repress them too much. He, no doubt, was mischievous as others are and had his fling of boyish spirits. Nor was he without his share in all the sports and manly excitements suitable to his age and condition. These were all useful to make him what he ought to be—a reasonable being giving a reasonable service to his Maker. There is one thing abhorrent to all Benedictine ideas of education, and that is the formation of the prig. So we may be sure the result in the case of John Weston was not that.

"For some time, since his fourteenth year, there had been going on a gradual awakening of the boy's soul; and he was beginning to question himself. The old problems we have all had, doubtlessly, presented themselves over and over again: What is the meaning of life? Why was I made? Sometimes in the midst of his play or of his study, maybe when singing the *Credo* at high Mass or *Magnificat* at vespers, a seriousness and awe would fall upon him; and something ('twas the voice of God, but, at first, he knew it not) whispered to him: "God made you for Himself." The truth sank deeper and deeper in his soul, and he began to realize it was a personal and entire service God asked of him. And day by day the example he saw began to tell more and more on the lad. 'The monks are serving God. That is why they are here. How peace-

ful and happy they are.' Such thoughts as these flashed across his mind; and the high ideal of life which the monastic state aims at began to attract him.

Then came one day, never to be forgotten; a great light dawned upon his soul. God spoke to him clearly and distinctly in one of the many ways He speaks to His creatures. Maybe it was some sudden sorrow, the death of his mother or of some other loved friend; or perhaps some sudden inrush of joy at a realization of God's fatherhood; or some word of the daily-heard office which suddenly broke upon him with a new meaning and struck home; or maybe some sin into which he had fallen and which mercifully revealed to him his own weakness: I must give myself to God, and here will I dwell forever.[1]

The story of Dom John's life in the cloister is quite in keeping with this pleasing picture of his boyhood and the first dawning of his religious vocation. And without losing anything of its attractive simplicity the narrative is illustrated and its accuracy confirmed by occasional reference to the rule of St. Benedict and other authentic documents. Thus, we are given some curious details of the novice's outfit as set forth in the "Book of Ely" in the Lambeth MSS. This comprised, inter alia, "*Imprimis* i matras (matrass). *Item* ii par blankettys. *Item* ii par straglys (quilts). *Item* ii couverlytes. *Item* i furrypane. *Item* i blewbed de sago (bed-curtains of serge.)"[2]

Further interesting particulars as to the domestic life of the mediæval monks may be seen in the Appendix to Father Taunton's first volume, where he gives a valuable abstract of the Consuetudinary of Canterbury, drawn by Mr. Edmund Bishop from a manuscript contained in the Cottonian collection. Here we have some curious information concerning the officers of the Abbot's household, the chaplains, the chamberlain, the seneschal, the master of the hall, the carver, the waiter, the pantler, the master of the horse, the cook, the valet, the cupboard-man, the porter, the hall cook and servant, the Abbot's messenger, the palfrey-man, and the almoner. To judge by this lengthy list of officers, the veracious author of the ballad on "King John and the Abbot of Canterbury" would seem to have some warrant for his language anent the Abbot's "housekeeping and high estate." But we find no mention of the "twenty tall footmen" who "beyond any doubt, in velvet coats waited the Abbot about."

In his sketch of the pre-Reformation history of the Black Monks, our author's way is naturally cast in pleasant places and

1 Ps. xxiii., 6.

2 Vol. i., pp. 67-70.

in paths of peace. Here, at least, there is little likely to provoke hostile comment or kindle controversy. Some readers, however, may take exception to Father Taunton's treatment of the unfortunate conflict between St. Edmund and the monks of Canterbury. He has dwelt on this dispute, as he tells us, "in order to let the reader see the sort of trouble monastic chapters had to put up with until the situation was cleared; troubles in this case all the harder to bear, because the personal holiness of the Archbishop was so great." "It is no disrespect," he adds, "to the memory of a great saint to say he was not made of the stuff out of which a ruler is made, and was wanting in that tact so necessary for dealing with men." [1] And in a foot-note on this same page the author summarily rejects the very different verdict of St. Edmund's Benedictine biographer, Don Wilfrid Wallace of Erdington, and of Bishop Stubbs, the editor of the MS. document which is our chief authority for the details of the conflict. It is perhaps as well that the story should be told as it appears from the monks' point of view. For there is, to say the least, some danger that we may do injustice to those who were unhappily at variance with a saint, forgetting that they may have had reason to think themselves in the right, that a saint is like other mortals, liable to make mistakes, and what is more his contemporaries may sometimes fail to recognize the sanctity on which the Church had not yet set her seal, and his motives however excellent might easily be misunderstood. This much we are ready to allow; but we are, none the less, afraid that our author's explanation of the contest does less than justice to the great Archbishop. Is it really a "matter of fact" that St. Edmund "fell foul of every one from the highest to the lowest, priest and layman, with whom his great office brought him in contact?" The list of his conflicts is certainly long enough; but they are hardly as numerous as this language would imply. And, what is more, the number may be explained without throwing the blame on the saint's shoulders. The times were turbulent. The state was on the eve of civil war; the province of the Church was but too often invaded, while in the sanctuary itself, notably in the great monastic bodies, there was need of reform. In the face of these dangers and difficulties, the lot of an Archbishop was necessarily one of warfare. No doubt, mistakes were made on both sides, and milder measures might sometimes have been adopted with advantage.

1 Vol. i., p. 126.

But to some of us it will surely seem that St. Edmund's many struggles were due not so much to the absence of tact as to the presence of principle.

As Father Taunton's sketch of the bright period of mediæval monasticism was illustrated by the ideal history of Dom John Weston, Monk of Lynminster, so does his story of the downfall find life and unity in the real biography of "John Fecknam, Abbot of Westminster." In the chapter devoted to the memory of that glory of the English Benedictines, we see the part he played in the restoration under Mary, his sturdy defence of the truth in the troubled times that followed, the simple prudence of his answers to the Protestant prelates, and the patience and charity which brightened the dark days of his long imprisonment. Take, for instance, the following incident, which marked the beginning of his troubles :

"During the time of the debates in Parliament on the changes in religion, Abbot Fecknam was quietly going on at Westminster unmoved by the approaching storm. He kept his soul in peace through it all. He knew the consequences of his refusal of the queen's offer, but let the evil of the day take heed to itself. So he went on. The story goes that he was engaged in planting trees in his garden at Westminster when a message (? messenger) came to tell him that a majority of the House of Commons had declared for the dissolution of all religious houses, and remarked that he planted in vain, for that he and his monks would have to go. 'Not in vain,' replied the Abbot. 'Those that come after me may perhaps be scholars and lovers of retirement, and whilst walking under the shades of these trees they may sometimes think of the olden religion of England, and the last Abbot of this place.' And so he went on with his planting."[1]

Elsewhere in his work, Father Taunton very happily uses this story to illustrate the spirit of those later monks of St. Benedict who labored in building up anew the fallen fabric of the order in England; for they, too, like Abbot Fecknam, when all seemed lost and hopeless, quietly went on with their planting.

We are now brought to a chapter which contains much painful reading: "The State of English Catholics, 1559–1601," which is mainly occupied with the story of the unhappy struggle between the Jesuits and Seculars. Here, if we mistake not, many readers will find themselves constrained to part company with Father Taunton. Some, to whatever side their own sympathies are drawn,

1 Vol. i., pp. 191–2.

would fain have the whole matter buried in oblivion. In this we can by no means agree. To sacrifice the truth of history is ever a false and fatal policy. The government of Elizabeth and her successors has small claim on our forbearance ; but it is only right that the political intrigues of certain Catholics should be duly recorded along with the cruel and prolonged persecution which they, in some measure at least, provoked and embittered. So again, the Catholic champions of that time have left us a bright example in their loyalty to the faith, and their heroic patience under persecution. But the thoughtful student of history will find lessons scarcely less valuable in the painful story of their faults and failings, the hasty judgments, the jealousies, the misguided zeal which rent the little band of confessors into opposing factions. No loyal Catholic would wish to say anything likely to rekindle the fire of controversy between Seculars and Regulars. But a careful study of the story would hardly have this unfortunate result. It should rather serve as a timely warning against the spirit of party, and read us a wholesome lesson on unity and mutual forbearance.

In saying this we do not wish to identify ourselves with the position taken up by our author, or to accent his version of the matter without reserve or qualification. It was, indeed, hardly possible to treat the subject adequately in the limits allowed him by the proportions of his history, wherein the episode is, after all, a side issue. At the same time, the part taken by the Benedictines in the dispute, makes it hard for their devout historian to preserve an absolute impartiality. It would, however, take us too far to examine the picture in detail, or to say to what extent we agree with the author, and where we fail to follow him. We understand, moreover, that a Jesuit version of the story is under preparation, and the subject will, no doubt, be treated in these columns with greater advantage when that other side of the shield has been fairly shown to the world.

In his second volume, Father Taunton tells the story of the Benedictine mission of the early seventeenth century ; and shows us how the English Congregation arose from its ruins. The first foundations of the new fabric were laid on Spanish soil ; and for a time the English Black Monks were subject to the Spanish General. We are told that this temporary dependence ceased in 1661. But we have found some trace of its survival at a somewhat later date. In an edition of Cardinal Aguirre's invaluable *Theologia Sancti Anselmi*, brought out at Rome, in 1688, the learned author is styled General

Master of the Congregation of the Spains and England. In a later work of the same author, printed in 1698, the word *Angliae* is omitted.

There is much in this second volume which will have a special interest for English Catholics. Old students of Downside, and Ampleforth, and Douai, will read with pleasure of the first beginnings and the changing fortunes of these Benedictine monasteries, now gradually forming in France or Flanders, now happily transplanted to their English homes, or returning to strike fresh roots in foreign soil. But many readers will turn with yet greater interest to the chapter which tells of Dom Leander's mission to England, his friendship with Archbishop Laud, his picture of the Anglican Church, his fruitless attempts to bring about a union, strangely anticipating the too sanguine hopes and illusory overtures of certain ecclesiastics of our own days.

Readers of this REVIEW are not unacquainted with Father Taunton's style ; and in this respect at least the present work is no new departure. The story from beginning to end is eminently readable, and is told with a grave simplicity quite in keeping with its subject. The black robe of St. Benedict needs no purple patches. Here and there we meet with some of those lighter touches with which Father Taunton's readers are familiar. Thus the unfortunate prisoners entrusted to Elizabeth's prelates are described as being only suffered to take the air "tied to the strings of a Protestant bishop's apron."

Having finished his chronicle of the English Benedictine Congregation, Father Taunton devotes an additional chapter to the "Other Benedictine Houses, Denizen and Alien," which have taken root on English soil. Here we have some account of the abbeys of Benedictine nuns at East Bergholt, Colwich, Teignmouth and Princethorpe, together with a brief notice of the Cassinese monastery at Ramsgate, and the more recent foreign foundations at Buckfast, Erdington and Farnborough.

Father Taunton fitly ends his work with a passage which blends the spirit of Benedictine peace and conciliation, with the missionary zeal of the Black Monks who were England's first apostles.

"This account of St. Benedict's patrimony in England cannot close without casting a wistful glance at other bodies of earnest souls outside who are striving after light, and seeking salvation under the patronage of the Holy Patriarch. May they too be brought in to join the great chorus of monastic praise which now goes up daily

from so many English lips before the throne of God!" *Faxit Deus!*

W. H. KENT, O.S.C.

Bayswater, London, England.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CARDINAL WISEMAN. By Wilfred Ward. In two volumes. Pp. x., 578 and 656. London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1897. Pr. $6.00.

(*First notice.*)

When the recent publication of Cardinal Manning's life by Mr. Purcell called forth the desire for a correction of the somewhat distorted portrait, it was answered by the suggestion that the time for forming an historical estimate of the great figure had not yet come. The present generation stands too close to the monument to take a just view of either its height or its beautiful proportions. Men shall have to get away from it a generation or two in order to understand its grand effect upon the surroundings and the measure of its shadow. But such an objection cannot be made to a biography of Cardinal Wiseman, who has passed from the scene of intercourse with his generation more than thirty years. Nor could there have been found a better artist to place the figure, and lead us to view it in the proper light, than Mr. Wilfred Ward. Cardinal Manning had from the beginning, that is immediately upon the death of his great predecessor, collected the materials for a biography; Father Morris, who before he entered the Society of Jesus had been secretary to both the Cardinals, began in 1893 to put the matter in form for publication. But he did not get very far, and with the exception of the account of the "Errington case" the book is—facts apart—the work of the gifted son of him upon whose death Tennyson penned these singular lines:

> Farewell, whose living like I shall not find,
> —Whose faith and work were bells of full accord—
> My friend, thou most unworldly of mankind,
> Most generous of all ultramontanes, Ward!

Cardinal Wiseman had been a frequent visitor at Northwood or at Old Hall, where William Ward resided, and though our biographer was then but a boy, the traditional stories familiar to the members

of the household have helped him to picture the charming personality of the great man.

The accounts of Nicholas Wiseman's boyhood are scanty, indeed, but they contain some interesting and instructive features. He was born in Seville, but came of Irish ancestors, the Wiseman's being from Waterford, whilst his mother belonged to a family which had its home at one time in Kilkenny. After the father's death the little boy was taken to Waterford, where he attended boarding school for two years ; afterwards, at the age of eight, he was sent to Ushaw College where, we are told, he imbibed those habits of reserve, deep piety and concentration of purpose which are characteristic of the place. "Not words, but deeds," the Cardinal wrote in later life, "is the suitable motto for Ushaw." Strangely enough, though the fact is not uncommon with men of exceptional gifts, he was regarded by those who came across him casually, as a stupid boy, and he made few friends among his college companions and the professors. At the same time it was noticed by others that he had great powers of application and gradually developed a taste for reading and independent study. He describes himself at that time as a "lone unmurmuring boy," who studied while others played. In a letter to a young nephew, he writes : "I was always considered stupid and dull by my companions, and made hardly any friends, and never got any notice or favor from superiors. . . . I am sure I never said a witty or clever thing all the time I was at college, but I used to think a good deal. . . . The great lesson which I learnt during the desolate years of my college life is . . . self-reliance, not vanity or presumption, but the determination to work for myself" (pag. 7). Dr. Lingard, who was Vice-President of Ushaw at the time, seems however to have recognized the deeper and finer traits of the lad's nature, and markedly befriended him.

At the age of sixteen he was sent to the English College at Rome, which had just been reopened. Here his mind received those impressions which are apt to awaken enthusiasm, and the taciturn, studious, monotonous manner of the youth gave way to a certain intensity of expression together with that love of adventure which showed itself in his account of his subsequent life. He came to the Holy City at a time most auspicious for one of his disposition and talents. Pius VII. had returned to Rome in triumph. There were among the remarkable men known to Europe a Canova, Overbeck, Cornelius, Brandis, the historian of Greek philosophy, Niebuhr, and a host of thinkers, scholars and artists, both Protestants and Catholics,

who, to use Bunsen's words, "made up a society such as can never before have been so good in Rome." These men diffused about them an atmosphere which created noble ambition and deepened the impressions of wonder and reverence which Eternal Rome produces in every serious nature by its marvellous works of the past, and its never changing aspect of faith. The life at the college had its measure of continental severity; but it suited young Wiseman's disposition. Every day, except Thursday and Sunday, lectures were attended on philosophy, theology, canon law, Church history, Biblical exegesis, as the case might be, and the rest of the morning was devoted to study. The afternoon was allotted to a walk through the city, either to some object of interest—a church or a museum—or to one of the Palazzos, or to Monte Pincio, where friends would meet the collegians and exchange greetings or converse. They went *in camerata* in the city, but outside or on Monte Pincio they might disperse, and reassemble for their return home.

Among the influences which especially acted upon his mind, and which we recognize later on in two of his books, *Fabiola* and *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, were the historical studies of early Christian events made by him in the Catacombs, shrines and museums; and the effect of the frequent sight of the Sovereign Pontiff. "I record impressions," he writes,—"impressions never to be effaced. It may be that youth, by its warmth, softens the mould in which they are made, so that they sink deeper, and are produced at the same time more strongly and definitely; but certainly those earlier pictures remain in the memory as the standard types of what has been many times again seen."

Before he had reached his twenty-second year he took his degree as Doctor of Divinity. At the public disputation there were present two men with whom Wiseman had formed an acquaintance—one a monk, Father Cappellari, the other the brilliant Abbé De Lamennais whose writings Cappellari, when he had become Gregory XVI., was forced to censure. Of De Lamennais who was then the most conspicuous figure in the Catholic world, owing to the open avowal of his daring programme, by which he hoped to unite democracy with Ultramontanism, Dr. Wiseman gives the following description:

"He was in look and appearance almost contemptible; small, weakly, without pride of countenance or mastery of eye, without any external grace . . . Several times have I held long conversations with him at various intervals, and he was always the same. With his head hung down, his hands clasped before him, or gently moving in one another, he poured forth in

answer to a question a stream of thought flowing spontaneous and unrippled as a brook through a summer meadow. He at once seized the whole subject, divided it into heads as symmetrically as Fléchier or Massillon; then took them one by one, enunciated each, and drew his conclusions."

In the same group of acquaintances and friends with whom Dr. Wiseman was associated at this time, we find Montalembert, Lacordaire and Rio—"the most striking Frenchman," says Mr. Gladstone of the last mentioned, "I ever knew. He had all Montalembert's charm without his faults."

During the following twelvemonths Dr. Wiseman received sacred orders, after which he was free to pursue the bent of his tastes for two years when he was appointed to the vice-rectorship of the English College. Much of his time was spent in the Vatican library among various Roman collections of manuscripts, and he speaks in later years with great fondness of the learned Monsignor, afterwards Cardinal, Mai, who was a guide and counsellor to the young scholar. In 1827 Dr. Wiseman published his first work, *Horae Syriacae*. It consisted of three dissertations. The first was an argument for the literal meaning of the text "Hoc est enim corpus meum." The others, which gave him at once the reputation of solid scholarship, are philological contributions to the History of the Syriac Versions of the Old Testament. The text which he was the first to have examined was the one known as the *Karkaphensian* Codex, made for the use of the Monophysites, and substantially identical with the *Peshito*. This publication brought him into relations with the foremost Oriental scholars of Europe, who came to consult the Arabic and other MSS. in the Vatican, which had been placed under the special care of Dr. Wiseman. The short years of close reading and study during his college and seminary course now showed their fruits. He was not only an expert on Oriental MSS., but he knew very much more. "He can speak with readiness and point," wrote Cardinal Newman, some years later, "in half a dozen languages without being detected for a foreigner in any of them." He was thoroughly familiar with the literature of France, Germany and Italy. He was a musical critic as well as an art critic, and a practical musician into the bargain. He possessed a minute knowledge of ceremonial and liturgy, was a collector of old china, and could converse with ease and accuracy on any topic that might come up in a mixed society. In short, he was, says his biographer, the ideal of a well-informed man—'who knows something of everything and everything of something.' You might see

him sometimes in the large halls of the Vatican, detaching himself from his *camerata* of the English College to talk to Cardinal Mezzofanti; they would converse in Arabic or in Persian to the delight of the students who were proud of their leader's attainments. In 1828 Dr. Wiseman was appointed Rector of the English College, which position he held for twelve years. He made many friends during that time, although it also happened that the impression he left on persons who, like George Ticknor, casually met him, was not equal to his reputation. Archbishop Trench, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Macaulay, John Henry Newman, Hurrell Froude, Henry Edward Manning, were among his admirers.

Before we turn from this, perhaps most influential, period of his life, to dwell on Dr. Wiseman's literary and administrative activity in England, something should be said of his weekly sermons to English audiences, which he had first undertaken, at the request of Leo XII., in 1827, when still vice-rector of the college. The amount of good these sermons effected cannot easily be calculated. Without any attempt at proselytizing, as Mr. Gladstone, in giving his recollections of those days, distinctly avers, the young orator gained his audiences and made numerous converts by his judicious yet warm-hearted appeals to their reason. "These sermons," says a writer in the *Dublin Review* of 1865, when they had been published for the first time in England, "are written in a very pure, calm and vigorous English. There is about them a depth of patient and careful thought, a calm piety, and a profound knowledge of Holy Scripture. . . . They show a sustained habit of reflection, and no common insight into the minds and dangers of other men. Some of them strike us as highly subjective; a quality of the first importance in a preacher, who by the study of himself, delineates to others their own unspoken consciousness. . . . We can imagine the years of solitary study, and still more solitary meditations in the corridors, the garden and the chapel of the venerable English College in Rome, of which these sermons are the secret record."

But it was not only labor and talent which produced such exquisite work, whether we regard it as coming from the intellect, or the heart, or both. During the eight years whilst he was employed in the composition of the *Horae Syriacae* and preaching, he suffered intense mental agonies of which only those who have been heated in a like crucible of mental purification can have an adequate conception. During Lent 1834 that state finally passed away, and he

felt renewed. And with the revived vigor the thought of going back to England came strongly upon him. The following year he visited England. Shortly after that the *Dublin Review* was founded, and this became another tie which drew him to the land where, he hoped, a fresh revival of religion might be effected, more fruitful even than that which was beginning at the same time in France, where Lacordaire was giving his conferences, and in Germany and Tuscany, where a reaction against Protestant governmental autocracy, on the one hand, and the Erastian and Jansenistic movement on the other, were being strongly felt.

(*To be continued.*)

THE LITTLE OFFICE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY according to the Roman Breviary. Arranged for Public Recitation; with an Appendix of Various Prayers. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1897.

The Office is in Latin, with the rubrics and directions to the prefect of the Sodality, etc., in English. In addition, three pages of prefatory remarks are devoted to interesting explanation of the Office and of the manner of reciting it according to proper accents. The reference to Dom Pothier's classic work will, unfortunately, be useless in most cases, we think; first, because it is in French; and secondly, because even in French it cannot be purchased without some expenditure of trouble; thirdly, because one should have studied the learned Benedictine's reasoning very carefully before attempting to reduce his theories to practice. Without such preparatory study, who shall explain the meaning of the compiler's remarks concerning *accentuation*? For further discussion of this point, let our readers consult the "Conference" (pag. 311) in this issue of REVIEW.

H. T. H.

HAND-BOOK OF RULES FOR SINGING AND PHRASING PLAIN SONG. By the Benedictines of Stanbrook. London and Leamington: Art and Book Company; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1896.

This small pamphlet is a sequel to the "Gregorian Music" already noticed in the REVIEW. It summarizes well the theory and

practice of the chant as elaborated thoroughly in the work of Dom Pothier and the "Gregorian Music." The remarks on rhythm, pauses and their preparation, the singing of the Psalms, the proper tempo for Plain Song, expression and accompaniment, are admirably concise, clear and practicable. A competent choirmaster, instructed in the theory and practice of the chant as edited by the Benedictines of Solesmes, will find the pamphlet of great service in teaching choirs—not as an exposition, however, so much as a convenient note-book for refreshing in a summary way the memory of pupils. Two tables, giving the *traditional* and the *modern* forms of Neums and Liquescent Neums ; as also four examples from the gradual in both *Plain Song* and *modern* notation, increase the value of the pamphlet.

H. T. H.

INFIRMORUM LIBER catholicus decem linguis exaratus. Cum Approbat. Ordinar. Viennensis.

We announced in our last Book Review an edition of Canon Anderl's *Liber Infirmorum* in ten languages for the use of priests who have to attend sick-calls among people of different nationalities. Since then we are informed that an eleventh fasciculus in the *Ruthenian* language has been added. But there is no English version which would render the book of practical utility to our clergy. The translation could, we fancy, be easily supplied if any of our Catholic publishers would have an understanding with the author and publisher in Austria (Can. Adalbert Anderl, Tabor Str. 19, Vienna II).

BOOKS RECEIVED.

VIE DU CARDINAL MANNING. Par L'Abbé H. Hemmer. Paris : P. Lethielleux. 1898. Pp. 494. Pr. 5 frcs.

LA GRACE ET LA GLOIRE ou La Filiation Adoptivé des Enfants de Dieu Étudiée dans sa Réalité, ses Principes, son Perfectionnement et son Couronnement Final. Par le R. P. J.-B. Terrien, S. J. 2 vols. in 8 vo. I., 432 ; II., 424. Paris : P. Lethielleux. 1898. Pr. 9 frcs.

DE L'APOLOGETIQUE "TRADITIONNELLE" ET DE L' APOLOGETIQUE "MODERNE." Par le R. P. X.-M. Le Bachelet, S. J. Paris : P. Lethielleux. Pp. 157. Pr. 1½ frcs.

OUR LADY OF AMERICA, Liturgically Known as Holy Mary of Guadalupe. By the Rev. G. Lee, C. S. Sp. Baltimore and New York: John Murphy & Co. 1897. Pp. 300. Pr. $1.00.

THE LITTLE OFFICE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY according to the Roman Breviary. Arranged for public recitation. Baltimore and New York: John Murphy & Co. 1897. Pp. 127. Pr. 40 cents.

HOFFMANN'S CATHOLIC DIRECTORY, ALMANAC AND CLERGY LIST. 1898. Published by M. H. Wiltzius & Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS ad mentem Patris Antonii Ballerini, S. J. Opera et studio Rev. D. A. Donovan, O. Cist. In 3 vols. Vol. ii. De Justitia et Jure; De Contractibus et Testamentis; De Sacramentis, etc., etc. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1897. Pp. 409.

MOTION: Its Origin and Conservation. An essay by the Rev. Walter McDonald, D.D., Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Dublin: Browne & Nolan; London: Burns & Oates. 1898. Pp. 457. Pr. 7/6.

VISITS TO JESUS IN THE TABERNACLE with a Novena to the Holy Ghost and Devotions for Mass, Holy Communion, etc. Adapted by the Rev. Francis Xavier Lasance. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1898. Pp. 636. Pr. $1.25.

THE NEW TESTAMENT OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST. Translated from the Latin Vulgate. With the *Imprimatur* of the Most Rev. Archbishop of New York. The same. 1898. Pp. 495. Pr. $1.00.

THE CATHOLIC FATHER. A Manual of Instructions and Devotions for the use of Catholic Fathers in Modern Times. By the Right Rev. Dr. Augustine Egger, Bishop of St. Gall. Revised and adapted for use in the United States. The same. 1898. Pp. 635. Pr. 75 cents.

COMMENTARIUS DE JUDICIO SACRAMENTALI quem S. Alphonso dicabat Sac. Jo. Baptista Pighi, S. T. D. Editio altera emendata et aucta. Veronae edidit Felix Cinquetti. 1897. Pp. 70. Pr. l. o. 80. *Appendice al Commentario.* Pr. l. o.15.

NEAPOL WEZUWIUSZ I POMPEJI Wrazenia z Podrozy Opisal X. Waclaw Kruszka. Milwaukee, Wis.: Nakladem Autora. Czcionkami F. Raniszewskiego. 1898. Cena 50 centow.

MEMORIES OF FATHER HEALY of Little Bray. Third Edition. London: Richard Bentley & Son. New York: Benziger Bros. 1898. Pp. 343.

BRUNO AND LUCY or The Ways of the Lord are Wonderful. From the German of Wilhelm Herchenbach. Revised by the Rev. W. H. Eyre, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Bros. 1898. Pp. 301. Pr. 80 cents.